APPENDIX A

COMPARISON SITE SELECTION

The best comparison sites for the evaluation of the Elderly Nutrition Demonstration will be those that will experience the same trends in elderly FSP participation as the pilot site, all else being equal. In designing this evaluation, we have identified for each pilot up to ten comparison sites in the same state that we expect will experience similar participation patterns.

The process for identifying comparison sites involved two steps. The first step was to identify preliminary comparison sites–the sites that are most similar to the pilot site based on key characteristics. For pilot sites that are counties, preliminary comparison sites are the other counties in the state that are most similar to the pilot county; for pilot sites that are towns, preliminary comparison sites are the other towns in the state that are most similar to the pilot town. We identified similar sites by analyzing data on elderly FSP participation trends, elderly population size, racial composition, and population density of each comparable site in the state. These characteristics were selected because they are correlated with elderly participation levels and patterns. We used these data to construct a similarity index in which a low index value indicates that a site is relatively similar to the pilot site. We selected the sites with the lowest index scores as the preliminary comparison sites. In each state, the number of preliminary comparison sites, as well as the range of similarity index score for those sites, varies.

In the second step, we discussed with state officials the preliminary comparison sites to determine whether they differ from the pilot sites in terms of characteristics not easily measured by the similarity index. For example, we discussed whether important differences existed in FSP service environments, transportation, and FSP supplements and alternatives. We also asked state officials to comment on the face validity of each comparison site. We removed from the preliminary comparison group those sites that were viewed to be a bad match with the pilot site. The sites remaining form the final comparison group for each pilot.

In conducting the analysis, the evaluator will base their findings on the differences observed between the pilot and comparison sites. The evaluator will conduct a sensitivity analysis of the findings by examining other comparison sites. As discussed in Chapter II, the sensitivity analysis will include examining a "second tier" of comparison sites – those sites with the lowest similarity index scores but not in the initial comparison group. The sensitivity analysis also will include examining those sites not in the initial comparison group but with service environment issues similar to the pilot site.

This appendix describes the steps taken to identify all comparison sites. First, we describe the similarity index used to identify similar sites. We then explain the steps taken to identify other similarities and dissimilarities. Finally, we explain the comparison sites chosen for each pilot site and describe special comparison sites that should also be used. The comparison sites identified here represent the best comparison sites given the information available at this time. The comparison sites ultimately used in the evaluation may change before or during the evaluation as new information about the appropriateness of each site becomes available.

A. SIMILARITY INDEX

We used a similarity index to identify preliminary comparison sites – those most similar to the pilot site in each state. To construct the similarity index for each possible comparison site, we selected six key characteristics that are correlated with changes in elderly FSP participation:

1. The number of elderly FSP participants in the site in one month of 2001[1]
2. The percentage change in elderly FSP participation from 2000 to 2001[2]

[1]Measures of elderly FSP participation were obtained from the state food stamp programs. The counts typically refer to one month in the fall of 2001.

[2]Measures of the change in elderly FSP participation were calculated by using elderly participation counts from the same months of 2000 and 2001. Elderly participation counts were obtained from the state food stamp programs.

3. The percentage of all elderly individuals in the site that participate in the FSP[3]
4. The percentage of all individuals in the site that is elderly[4]
5. The percentage of all individuals in the site that is nonwhite[5]
6. The population density of the site[6]

Sites that are similar along these six characteristics are more likely to have similar changes in the elderly FSP caseload over time.

The similarity index is designed to rank all sites in each state based on how similar they are to the pilot site. The index accounts for differences across sites in the size and in the range of values for each characteristic. The differences are measured in absolute terms so that a difference in one direction for one characteristic does not compensate for a difference in the reverse direction on another item. Additionally, the differences in the characteristic values are measured in relative terms. Specifically, we divide each absolute difference by the total range in values (computed over the potential comparison sites and the demonstration site). The advantage of this process is that if the pilot site has the maximum (minimum) value on the characteristic, a

---

[3]The percent of elderly that participate in the FSP was calculated using administrative counts of the number of elderly participants divided by the total number elderly individuals in the site obtained from the 2000 decennial Census. Note that elderly FSP participants include individuals age 60 and over, but total elderly counts in the Census include only individuals age 65 and over. This discrepancy exists because, at the time the index was created, the only counts of elderly individuals available from the 2000 Census were those for individuals age 65 and older. While this will overstate the percentage of elderly age 60 and over that participate in the FSP, the relative size of the overstatement should be consistent across all sites.

[4]The percent of the population that is elderly was calculated using data from the 2000 decennial Census. Elderly individuals are defined in the Census as people age 65 and over.

[5]The percent of the population that is nonwhite was calculated using data from the 2000 decennial Census.

[6]The population density, which is equal to the number of people per square mile, was calculated using data from the 2000 decennial census.

comparison site with the minimum (maximum) value will receive a relative difference value of 1.0 (representing a 100 percent deviation from the demonstration site). Similarly, if the demonstration site has a middle value on the characteristic, a comparison site with a minimum or maximum value will receive a difference value of .50 (representing a 50 percent departure from the demonstration site). Hence, with this approach, the relative differences range from 0 to 1 and can be interpreted like a percentage that reflects the relative departure of the comparison site from the demonstration site in question. The contribution of each characteristic to the overall index is determined using a set of weights. In the end, the comparison site or sites with the lowest score on the index becomes the comparison site(s) that most closely matches the demonstration site with respect to the considered factors.

Formally, this type of metric is computed as in equation (1) below.

$$(1) \qquad Index = \sum_i w_i \left[\frac{\left| X_{C,i} - X_{D,i} \right|}{X_{MAX,i} - X_{MIN,i}} \right]$$

In equation (1), $X_{C,i}$ denotes the value for a specific characteristic (e.g., the number of elderly FSP participants), indexed by i, for a prospective comparison site. Likewise $X_{D,i}$ denotes the corresponding value from the demonstration site, and $X_{MAX,i}$ and, $X_{MIN,i}$ denote the maximum and minimum values of this characteristic among all potential comparison sites (including the demonstration site). Finally, w_i is the weight that each characteristic is given in computing the index.

To see how this works, suppose that the similarity index is based only on two characteristics: (1) the number of elderly participants at the site and (2) the percentage of non-white people at the site. Also suppose that the demonstration site has a value of 500 applicants for the first characteristic and 20 percent non-white for the second. Among the potential

comparison sites, the range in values on the first characteristic is 300 to 500 (a 200 participant range), and for the second, it is 10 to 30 percent (a 20 percentage point range). In this case, the demonstration site has the maximum value on the first characteristic and a middle value on the second. Finally, suppose that one of the potential comparison sites has a value of 480 participants on the first characteristic and a value of 30 percent on the second characteristic. As a result, this comparison site receives a relative absolute difference of (480-500)/200=.10 for the first characteristic and (30 – 20)/20 = .50 for the second characteristic. If these two characteristics have equal weights, we obtain a similarity index of .30 for this comparison site, representing an average departure from the demonstration site of 30 percent across the two characteristics considered.

The weights used in the similarity index reflect the relative amount of influence that a change in each characteristic is estimated to have in affecting elderly FSP participation. Using site-level data from the demonstration states, we estimated a regression equation to determine the relationship that each of the similarity index component characteristics has on changes in FSP participation. The standardized coefficients from the regression equation were used to construct the weights for the similarity index. Formally, we estimated the following regression equation:

$$(2) \qquad \Delta P_i = \alpha X1_i + \delta X2_i + \phi X3_i + \gamma X4_i + \eta X5_i + \varpi X6_i + \varepsilon$$

where,

ΔPi = the change in elderly FSP participation from 2000 to 2001 in site *i*
$X1_i$ = the number of elderly FSP participants in 2000 in site *i*
$X2_i$ = the percent of all elderly that participated in the FSP in 2000 in site *i*
$X3_i$ = the percent change in elderly FSP participation from 1999 to 2000 in site *i*
$X4_i$ = the percent of the population that is nonwhite in 2000 in site *i*
$X5_i$ = the percent of the population that is elderly in 2000 in site *i*
$X6_i$ = the population density in 2000 in site *i*

Because these relationships may be affected by whether the pilot site is a county or a town, this regression was estimated twice: once to create weights for the four states that have county pilot sites (Florida, Maine, Michigan, and North Carolina) and once to create weights for the one state that has town pilot sites (Connecticut). The county-level equation was estimated using data from all counties in Florida, Maine, and North Carolina. (Michigan data were not available when these weights were created). The town-level equation was estimated using data from all towns in Connecticut. Table A.1 presents the final weights developed through these equations.

TABLE A.1

FINAL WEIGHTS FOR SIMILARITY INDEX

Characteristic	Weights for County Sites	Weights for Town Sites
Number of elderly FSP participants	0.10	0.18
Percent of all elderly that participate	0.26	0.34
Percent change in elderly FSP participation	0.16	0.21
Percent of the population that is nonwhite	0.27	0.10
Percent of the population that is elderly	0.14	0.12
Population density	0.07	0.05
N	210	156
R^2	0.1359	0.0950

In states with county pilot sites, the similarity index will give the most weight to the percent of the population that is nonwhite and the percent of all elderly that participate when identifying similar sites. In the one state with town pilot sites, the similarity index will give the most weight to three factors: the percent of all elderly that participate, the percent change in elderly participation and the number of elderly participants.

To identify preliminary comparison sites for each pilot site, we selected those sites with the lowest similarity index score. We did not use a constant index threshold to identify comparison sites for each state because the distribution of similar sites varied greatly from state to state. If the threshold is set too low (e.g., all sites with a similarity index less than 10.0) there are some pilot sites for which no comparison sites are selected. If the threshold is set too high (e.g., all sites with a similarity index less than 20.0), there are some pilot sites with dissimilar comparison sites that should be dropped. Instead, we defined the best comparison sites for each state as those that are most similar to the pilot site, given the distribution of similar sites. For each pilot site, we selected from one to ten preliminary comparison sites.

B. IDENTIFYING OTHER SIMILARITIES AND DISSIMILARITIES

The six characteristics we used in the similarity index are not the only characteristics that may be important in determining which sites are the best comparison sites. Other factors such as FSP operations, transportation and other environmental issues, which are more difficult to quantify, may also affect changes in elderly FSP participation over time. We used input from representatives in the pilot states to determine how the preliminary comparison sites differed from the pilot sites in terms of these characteristics.

We sent the list of preliminary comparison sites to the demonstration staff in each state. We then asked the staff to respond to questions such as the following:

- Do any of the preliminary comparison sites have different FSP service environments for the elderly? For example, are there any currently with elderly application procedures that differ from the procedures in the pilot site?
- Do any of the preliminary comparison sites have substantially different food stamp usage circumstances? For example, if the pilot site has an adequate number of grocery stores, are there any sites on the list with so few grocery stores as to be markedly different?

- Do any of the preliminary comparison sites have unique FSP outreach efforts that differ from outreach in the pilot site? For example, are there any sites with unique efforts to increase knowledge of FSP eligibility?
- Are any of the preliminary comparison sites significantly different from the pilot site in terms of compliments and alternatives to the FSP? For example, is there any site with substantially more or fewer food pantries, congregate meal sites, Meals on Wheels, etc.?
- Is transportation to the FSP office for the elderly significantly easier or more complicated in any of the preliminary comparison sites than it is for elderly in the pilot site?
- Do any of the preliminary comparison sites not make a good comparison with the pilot site for some other reason?
- Are there any other sites in the state that are a good match with the pilot site?

Based on the comments from the state representatives, we removed sites from the preliminary comparison group to create the final comparison group for each pilot site.

C. SELECTED COMPARISON SITES

This remainder of this Appendix describes the final comparison sites that were selected for each state. For each state, we describe the characteristics of the pilot and identify the comparison sites. Also, we explain any special steps we used to identify comparison sites for that state. Note that the comparison sites identified in this draft are not necessarily the final set of comparison sites that will be used in the evaluation, as we are still working with demonstration staff to identify the best comparison sites.

1. Florida

Florida is the only demonstration state with two pilot counties. In Florida, the simplified eligibility demonstration will be implemented in both Gadsden and Leon Counties, which are contiguous counties containing the city of Tallahassee and the surrounding area. In 2001, Gadsden County had almost 600 elderly FSP participants, about 6 percent of all elderly in

Gadsden County (Table A.2). The number of elderly participants declined 9.5 percent between 2000 and 2001. The population of Gadsden is predominantly nonwhite; about 12 percent of the population is elderly and there are 471 people per square mile. Leon County, which contains Tallahassee, is larger and has more elderly FSP participants. In 2001, there were 877 elderly FSP participants, about 2.9 percent of all elderly in the county and down 4.6 percent from 2000 (Table A.3). About one-third of Leon County is nonwhite; 8 percent are elderly and there are 815 people per square mile.

Table A.2 shows the comparison sites selected for Gadsden County. Three counties are in the comparison group for Gadsden County—Jackson, Hamilton, and Madison counties. Although Jackson County has a higher similarity index than a few counties not selected (Jackson County has a similarity index score of 21.9), it was included in the comparison group because it was identified by the grantee as an appropriate comparison site when other factors were considered. Hamilton and Madison counties are included because they have the lowest similarity index scores – 15.2 and 15.4, respectively.

Table A.3 shows the seven comparison sites selected for Leon County. All seven counties selected for the comparison group have similarity indices less than or equal to 10.0. Alachua County, which has the second-lowest similarity index score, is also the site identified by the grantee as an appropriate comparison site.

Because of Florida's unique two-county design, two separate types of comparisons can be made in the evaluation. First, the evaluator can compare independently the changes in Gadsden and Leon counties with their respective comparison groups. Second, the evaluator can compare the pooled pilot sites with the pooled comparison counties. Conducting both comparisons will give the evaluator a better understanding of the impact of Florida's demonstration.

TABLE A.2
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR GADSDEN COUNTY, FLORIDA

County	Similarity Index	Similarity Index Components: Elderly FSP Participants: Total	Elderly FSP Participants: Participation Rate	Elderly FSP Participants: Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot County							
Gadsden County	0.0	594	6.1	-9.5	61.3	12.2	471
Comparison Group							
1 * Jackson County	21.9	463	4.1	-5.9	29.8	14.6	404
2 * Hamilton County	15.2	93	3.8	-7.9	41.2	11.2	87
3 Madison County	15.4	224	5.2	-2.6	42.5	14.6	191
Mean	17.5	260	4.4	-5.5	37.8	13.5	227
Other Counties							
Jefferson County	17.1	210	6.7	0.5	40.7	14.5	161
Hardee County	19.7	314	5.4	-5.1	29.3	13.9	214
Hendry County	21.4	363	6.3	4.3	33.9	10.1	231
Leon County	23.7	877	2.9	-4.6	33.6	8.3	815
Taylor County	24.0	217	4.7	-6.1	22.2	14.1	203
Union County	25.5	104	6.5	2.0	26.4	7.5	80
Alachua County	25.7	1,209	3.8	-3.0	26.5	9.6	971
Duval County	25.7	3,420	2.5	-0.4	34.2	10.5	2946
Orange County	26.9	5,395	3.8	3.0	31.4	10.0	4236
Columbia County	27.1	512	4.6	-1.9	20.3	14.0	452
Escambia County	27.8	1,583	2.6	-0.7	27.6	13.3	1347
Liberty County	27.8	70	5.6	6.1	23.6	10.2	52
Washington County	28.2	336	5.9	1.5	18.3	15.7	245
Bradford County	29.2	235	4.4	5.9	23.7	12.9	181
Calhoun County	29.4	246	8.4	-0.4	20.1	14.0	192
Gulf County	29.6	142	4.1	-1.4	20.1	16.2	115
Gilchrist County	30.1	133	5.1	-4.3	9.5	13.6	120
Lafayette County	30.5	58	4.7	7.4	20.7	12.4	40
Suwannee County	30.8	410	4.8	-1.4	15.5	16.9	310
Dixie County	30.8	217	6.6	-2.7	11.2	17.1	174
Hillsborough County	30.8	6,661	3.4	4.5	24.8	12.0	4978
Bay County	30.8	1,048	3.4	-2.8	15.8	13.4	881
Okeechobee County	31.0	186	1.9	-12.7	20.7	16.3	163
Holmes County	31.9	369	8.0	-4.2	10.2	14.8	310
Franklin County	32.3	65	2.1	-4.4	18.8	15.7	57
Putnam County	32.4	798	3.4	1.5	22.1	18.5	625
Levy County	33.1	387	4.0	-2.0	14.1	17.9	286
Nassau County	33.8	265	2.9	-3.6	10.0	12.6	224
Broward County	34.3	9,215	2.0	6.0	29.4	16.1	7020
Polk County	34.5	3,759	2.7	0.2	20.4	18.3	2963
Walton County	34.7	301	3.2	-2.0	11.6	15.8	257
Okaloosa County	35.6	461	1.7	2.4	16.6	12.1	419
St. Lucie County	36.2	1,269	2.1	-1.6	20.9	22.7	988

*Also similar to Leon County

TABLE A.2(Continued)
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR GADSDEN COUNTY, FLORIDA

County	Similarity Index	Similarity Index Components: Elderly FSP Participants: Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Baker County	36.9	178	5.8	17.1	16.0	9.2	127
Osceola County	37.1	1,200	4.2	20.2	22.8	11.4	644
DeSoto County	37.1	221	2.5	11.6	26.7	19.0	163
Monroe County	37.3	584	2.3	-1.4	9.3	14.6	461
Glades County	37.9				23.0	18.8	0
Wakulla County	38.6	138	4.1	13.1	13.9	10.3	107
Brevard County	39.0	1,927	1.5	-3.2	13.2	19.9	1747
Marion County	39.1	2,184	2.7	-0.7	15.8	24.5	1754
St. Johns County	40.2	413	1.5	0.2	9.1	15.9	312
Sumter County	40.7	472	3.5	4.9	17.4	27.4	376
Palm Beach County	40.8	5,418	1.5	3.0	20.9	23.2	4056
Santa Rosa County	41.3	413	2.5	9.0	9.3	11.0	299
Collier County	41.8	976	1.5	-1.0	13.9	24.5	737
Volusia County	42.1	2,353	1.5	1.7	13.9	22.1	1850
Seminole County	42.3	694	1.2	13.8	17.6	10.6	407
Clay County	42.5	404	2.2	12.2	12.6	9.8	246
Lake County	43.6	1,240	1.6	-0.3	12.5	26.4	1009
Pinellas County	43.7	5,001	1.3	2.7	14.1	22.5	4116
Manatee County	46.2	1,076	1.0	5.5	13.6	24.9	820
Indian River County	46.3	581	1.3	1.4	12.6	29.2	511
Lee County	46.6	1,645	1.1	4.4	12.3	25.4	1222
Citrus County	47.7	713	1.3	-6.3	5.0	32.2	592
Highlands County	49.3	668	1.6	8.6	16.5	33.0	480
Pasco County	49.4	1,804	1.1	3.0	6.3	26.8	1423
Hernando County	49.7	600	1.0	0.3	7.1	30.9	513
Sarasota County	50.4	1,092	0.7	-0.2	7.4	31.5	941
Flagler County	50.6	172	1.1	10.3	12.7	28.6	112
Martin County	51.5	415	0.8	8.9	10.1	28.2	349
Charlotte County	52.4	612	0.9	1.7	7.4	34.7	506
Miami-Dade County	52.9	74,916	14.7	0.1	30.3	13.3	59811
Mean		2,247	3.5	1.3	20.0	17.5	1,755
Median		472	2.9	0.2	17.9	15.3	406
Min		58	0.7	-12.7	5.0	7.5	0
Max		74,916	14.7	20.2	61.3	34.7	59,811

TABLE A.3
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA

			Similarity Index Components					
			Elderly FSP Participants					
County		Similarity Index	Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot County								
	Leon County	0.0	877	2.9	-4.6	33.6	8.3	815
Comparison Group								
1	Alachua County	6.6	1,209	3.8	-3.0	26.5	9.6	971
2	Duval County	4.8	3,420	2.5	-0.4	34.2	10.5	2946
3 *	Jackson County	8.0	463	4.1	-5.9	29.8	14.6	404
4	Escambia County	8.0	1,583	2.6	-0.7	27.6	13.3	1347
5	Orange County	8.4	5,395	3.8	3.0	31.4	10.0	4236
6 *	Hamilton County	8.7	93	3.8	-7.9	41.2	11.2	87
7	Hardee County	10.0	314	5.4	-5.1	29.3	13.9	214
	Mean	7.8	1782	3.7	-2.9	31.5	11.9	1458
Other Counties								
	Hendry County	12.0	363	6.3	4.3	33.9	10.1	231
	Franklin County	12.6	65	2.1	-4.4	18.8	15.7	57
	Hillsborough County	12.8	6,661	3.4	4.5	24.8	12.0	4978
	Taylor County	12.8	217	4.7	-6.1	22.2	14.1	203
	Madison County	12.9	224	5.2	-2.6	42.5	14.6	191
	Bay County	13.0	1,048	3.4	-2.8	15.8	13.4	881
	Columbia County	13.9	512	4.6	-1.9	20.3	14.0	452
	Union County	14.0	104	6.5	2.0	26.4	7.5	80
	Nassau County	14.1	265	2.9	-3.6	10.0	12.6	224
	Gulf County	14.5	142	4.1	-1.4	20.1	16.2	115
	Broward County	14.5	9,215	2.0	6.0	29.4	16.1	7020
	Polk County	14.8	3,759	2.7	0.2	20.4	18.3	2963
	Putnam County	14.8	798	3.4	1.5	22.1	18.5	625
	Bradford County	15.2	235	4.4	5.9	23.7	12.9	181
	Okaloosa County	15.9	461	1.7	2.4	16.6	12.1	419
	Okeechobee County	16.2	186	1.9	-12.7	20.7	16.3	163
	Liberty County	16.2	70	5.6	6.1	23.6	10.2	52
	Jefferson County	16.3	210	6.7	0.5	40.7	14.5	161
	St. Lucie County	16.4	1,269	2.1	-1.6	20.9	22.7	988
	Walton County	16.5	301	3.2	-2.0	11.6	15.8	257
	DeSoto County	17.5	221	2.5	11.6	26.7	19.0	163
	Monroe County	17.6	584	2.3	-1.4	9.3	14.6	461
	Levy County	17.7	387	4.0	-2.0	14.1	17.9	286
	Lafayette County	17.7	58	4.7	7.4	20.7	12.4	40
	Glades County	18.2				23.0	18.8	0
	Suwannee County	18.3	410	4.8	-1.4	15.5	16.9	310
	Gilchrist County	18.7	133	5.1	-4.3	9.5	13.6	120
	Brevard County	19.2	1,927	1.5	-3.2	13.2	19.9	1747
	Marion County	19.3	2,184	2.7	-0.7	15.8	24.5	1754
	Washington County	19.9	336	5.9	1.5	18.3	15.7	245

*Also similar to Gadsden County

TABLE A.3 (Continued)
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA

County	Similarity Index	Similarity Index Components					
		Elderly FSP Participants					
		Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Santa Rosa County	20.4	413	2.5	9.0	9.3	11.0	299
Clay County	20.4	404	2.2	12.2	12.6	9.8	246
St. Johns County	20.6	413	1.5	0.2	9.1	15.9	312
Palm Beach County	21.0	5,418	1.5	3.0	20.9	23.2	4056
Seminole County	21.0	694	1.2	13.8	17.6	10.6	407
Osceola County	21.5	1,200	4.2	20.2	22.8	11.4	644
Wakulla County	21.5	138	4.1	13.1	13.9	10.3	107
Calhoun County	21.8	246	8.4	-0.4	20.1	14.0	192
Collier County	22.0	976	1.5	-1.0	13.9	24.5	737
Volusia County	22.3	2,353	1.5	1.7	13.9	22.1	1850
Dixie County	23.3	217	6.6	-2.7	11.2	17.1	174
Sumter County	23.4	472	3.5	4.9	17.4	27.4	376
Gadsden County	23.7	594	6.1	-9.5	61.3	12.2	471
Lake County	23.8	1,240	1.6	-0.3	12.5	26.4	1009
Pinellas County	24.0	5,001	1.3	2.7	14.1	22.5	4116
Holmes County	24.3	369	8.0	-4.2	10.2	14.8	310
Baker County	25.2	178	5.8	17.1	16.0	9.2	127
Manatee County	26.4	1,076	1.0	5.5	13.6	24.9	820
Indian River County	26.7	581	1.3	1.4	12.6	29.2	511
Lee County	26.8	1,645	1.1	4.4	12.3	25.4	1222
Highlands County	29.6	668	1.6	8.6	16.5	33.0	480
Pasco County	29.6	1,804	1.1	3.0	6.3	26.8	1423
Citrus County	29.7	713	1.3	-6.3	5.0	32.2	592
Hernando County	30.1	600	1.0	0.3	7.1	30.9	513
Sarasota County	30.6	1,092	0.7	-0.2	7.4	31.5	941
Flagler County	31.0	172	1.1	10.3	12.7	28.6	112
Martin County	31.9	415	0.8	8.9	10.1	28.2	349
Charlotte County	32.8	612	0.9	1.7	7.4	34.7	506
Miami-Dade County	45.2	74,916	14.7	0.1	30.3	13.3	59811
Mean		2,270	3.4	1.4	19.9	17.4	1,773
Median		512	2.9	0.2	17.9	15.3	413
Min		58	0.7	-12.7	5.0	7.5	0
Max		74,916	14.7	20.2	61.3	34.7	59,811

As with all states, sensitivity analysis should be conducted on the impact estimates for Florida. This sensitivity analysis should begin by examining the next tier of similar sites – those with low similarity index scores but that are not in the initial comparison group. In addition, there is a separate set of special comparison sites that should be examined in the sensitivity analysis for Florida. Florida's demonstration involves both a simplified eligibility determination process and a one-page application. Because the one-page application resembles a treatment from the application assistance model and not the simplified eligibility model, USDA requested that Florida implement the one-page application in sites outside the two pilot sites. The demonstration staff agreed to implement the simplified eligibility in two comparison sites identified in their proposal – Alachua County (selected as Leon County's comparison site) and Jackson County (selected as Gadsden County's comparison site). To examine whether some of the effect of the demonstration appears to be driven by the shortened application as opposed to the simplified eligibility rules, the evaluators should compare the pilot sites with the two comparison sites that have the shortened application. If, for instance, the evaluation found that changes in participation in the pilot sites are identical to the changes in the sites with the shortened application, then that would be evidence that the change in participation is due to the shortened application and not the simplified eligibility rules.

One problem that evaluators will face in identifying the impact of Florida's simplified eligibility demonstration is that a separate FSP outreach demonstration is currently underway in the city of Tallahassee (which is located in Leon County). This outreach demonstration directly targets elderly nonparticipants (and it also targets legal immigrants and the working poor). The stated goal of the outreach demonstration is to inform potential clients of the rules and eligibility requirements and to help in the application process. As a result, it will be difficult to distinguish the impact of this outreach demonstration from the impacts of the simplified eligibility

demonstration in Leon County. To address this issue, the evaluators should carefully examine any differences in impacts observed between Leon and Gadsden counties. Evaluators should also use the process analysis and client satisfaction survey to attempt to determine the extent to which Leon County impacts are related to the Elderly Nutrition demonstration.

2. Maine

Maine's application assistance demonstration will be implemented in Waldo County, a predominantly rural county in the south central part of the state. In 2001, there were over 500 elderly FSP participants in Waldo County, reflecting about 10.4 percent of the county's elderly population (Table A.4). Elderly participation declined three percent between 2000 and 2001. The county is almost entirely white (2 percent nonwhite), and 13.6 percent is over 65. There are only 50 people per square mile.

Table A.4 shows the potential comparison sites considered for Waldo County. Of the 15 counties in Maine that were considered, Franklin County was selected as the primary comparison site for Waldo County. Franklin County was selected because it has the lowest similarity index, and because Maine officials indicate that it is an appropriate comparison site.

Because there is only one comparison site for Waldo County, sensitivity analysis will be particularly important in determining whether the observed effects are sensitive to the county selected. In conducting the sensitivity analysis, the evaluator should examine the next most-similar counties (Somerset and Piscataquis counties).

One unique component of Maine's demonstration is that the Rockland Food Stamp office, which serves Waldo County, also serves three other counties. When evaluating the impact of the demonstration in Waldo County, the evaluators should examine whether changes in this office are driving changes in all four counties. The evaluators should compare participation patterns in

TABLE A.4
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR WALDO COUNTY, MAINE

County	Similarity Index	Similarity Index Components					
		Elderly FSP Participants					
		Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot County							
Waldo County	0.0	511	10.4	-2.9	2.1	13.6	50
Comparison Group							
1 Franklin County	15.3	369	8.8	2.5	2.0	14.2	17
Other Counties							
Somerset County	16.7	845	11.6	2.7	2.0	14.3	13
Piscataquis County	17.6	280	9.3	-5.1	2.2	17.4	4
Kennebec County	21.9	1,180	7.1	-4.3	2.5	14.2	135
Androscoggin County	27.5	1,376	9.2	0.4	3.0	14.4	221
Penobscot County	29.7	1,644	8.7	0.3	3.4	13.1	43
Hancock County	26.6	431	5.2	0.2	2.4	16.0	33
Oxford County	27.0	747	8.5	4.6	1.7	16.1	26
York County	27.7	1,293	5.1	-0.5	2.4	13.6	188
Knox County	38.7	390	5.7	6.0	1.7	17.2	108
Sagadahoc County	44.1	228	5.3	4.6	3.5	12.3	139
Aroostook County	43.3	1,914	15.2	-0.7	3.2	17.0	11
Lincoln County	42.0	294	4.8	3.9	1.5	18.2	74
Cumberland County	55.6	1,924	5.4	2.0	4.3	13.3	318
Washington County	68.2	825	14.1	-0.1	6.5	17.3	13
Mean		895	8	1	2.5	15.0	92
Median		747	8	0	2.4	14.3	50
Min		228	5	-5	1.5	12.3	4
Max		1,924	15	6	4.3	18.2	318

Waldo County with average adjusted participation patterns in the three other counties served by the Rockland food stamp office. If they are similar, some differences between Waldo County and Franklin County sites may actually be driven by changes in the Rockland office that are not associated with the demonstration.

3. Michigan

Michigan data have not been received yet. We will create the comparison group when we receive the data (this will become Table A.5).

As with all states, sensitivity analysis should be conducted on the impact estimates for Michigan. This sensitivity analysis should begin by examining the next tier of similar sites – those with low similarity index scores but that are not in the initial comparison group. There also is a second set of sites that should be examined in the sensitivity analysis. Because Michigan's demonstration builds upon the existing MiCAFE on-line application system, a second set of special comparisons sites should be drawn from those counties that have the MiCAFE system in place. The presence or absence of the MiCAFE application may affect elderly participation patterns in the absence of the Elderly Nutrition Demonstration because the application currently prescreens for other nutrition programs and may include some FSP related outreach. It may be the case that the outreach associated with the MiCAFE application is driving the FSP participation trends. To test this hypothesis, the evaluation should compare participation patterns in Gennessee County with the average adjusted patterns in other, similar Project FRESH counties.

A second special issue in Michigan is that the city of Saginaw is currently implementing a variety of FSP outreach strategies through a demonstration project. This demonstration does not target directly the elderly. Rather, it targets low-income families with children, former TANF

TABLE A.5
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR GENNESSEE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

County	Similarity Index	Similarity Index Components					
		Elderly FSP Participants					
		Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density

DATA FORTHCOMING

recipients, and able-bodied adults. Nevertheless, elderly participation patterns in Saginaw County could be affected by this demonstration. Saginaw County is included in the list of 10 comparison counties in part because the demonstration staff initially selected it as the best comparison county for Gennessee County. However, the evaluators should examine whether elderly participation patterns in Saginaw County are distinctly different from patterns in the other comparison counties.

4. North Carolina

North Carolina's commodity alternative demonstration will be implemented in Alamance County. Alamance County is in the central part of the state, between Durham and Greensboro, and contains the city of Burlington. In 2001, there were 484 elderly FSP participants in Alamance County, about 1.6 percent of the county's elderly population (Table A.6). The number of elderly participants increased by 2.1 percent between 2000 and 2001. About a quarter of the county's population is nonwhite and 14 percent of the population is elderly. There are 303 people per square mile in Alamance County.

Table A.6 shows the 8 counties comprising the comparison group selected for Alamance County. Initially, we selected the 9 counties with similarity indices equal to 10.0 or less. Based on discussions with staff from North Carolina, we concluded that Chatham County is not a good comparison site because the county is dissimilar from Alamance County with respect to its degree of urbanization and other factors.

As with the other states, sensitivity analysis should be conducted for the impact estimates in North Carolina. In this case, the sensitivity analysis will be conducted by examining the next tier of similar sites – those with low similarity index scores but that are not in the initial comparison group.

TABLE A.6
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR ALAMANCE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA

			Similarity Index Components					
			Elderly FSP Participants					
	County	Similarity Index	Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot County								
	Alamance County	0.0	484	1.6	2.1	24.4	14.1	303
Comparison Group								
1	Rowan County	5.0	601	1.9	-1.3	20.0	14.0	255
2	Iredell County	7.6	326	1.4	-2.1	17.8	12.4	214
3	Stanly County	8.2	275	1.9	6.2	15.3	14.2	147
4	Cleveland County	8.2	755	3.5	1.6	23.2	13.5	208
5	Burke County	8.9	395	2.1	-1.5	14.0	13.4	176
6	Orange County	9.5	323	2.1	-2.1	22.0	8.4	296
7	Catawba County	9.7	657	2.4	4.8	15.0	12.3	354
8	Rockingham County	10.0	739	3.2	-3.3	22.7	14.8	162
	Mean	8.4	509	2.3	0.3	18.7	12.9	226
Other Counties								
	Chatham County	10.0	215	2.0	-10.0	25.1	15.3	72
	Gaston County	10.2	1,000	2.5	2.7	17.0	12.6	533
	Craven County	11.3	571	3.1	-3.9	30.1	13.4	131
	Carteret County	11.3	294	1.9	2.4	9.7	17.2	112
	Randolph County	11.3	346	1.4	7.1	10.8	12.1	166
	Camden County	11.6	49	3.0	6.5	19.4	13.6	29
	Cabarrus County	11.9	561	2.3	11.5	16.7	11.6	360
	Person County	12.2	276	3.4	-1.8	31.2	13.7	91
	Davidson County	12.4	927	3.1	3.0	12.9	12.8	267
	Forsyth County	12.4	1,016	1.6	-6.7	31.5	12.6	747
	Brunswick County	13.0	499	3.1	-3.1	17.7	16.9	86
	Union County	13.2	444	2.8	-2.4	17.2	9.0	194
	Lincoln County	13.6	260	2.3	7.0	9.8	11.5	213
	McDowell County	13.6	261	2.6	-1.5	7.8	14.3	95
	Jackson County	13.7	259	3.7	0.0	14.3	13.8	67
	Moore County	13.9	300	1.3	-5.4	19.8	21.8	107
	Buncombe County	14.0	1,299	2.5	-1.7	10.9	15.4	315
	Davie County	14.3	136	1.8	-9.3	9.6	13.8	131
	Lee County	14.4	278	2.6	-13.1	30.0	12.9	191
	Guilford County	14.5	1,668	2.1	1.2	35.5	11.8	648
	Alexander County	15.1	141	2.3	-2.8	8.0	11.9	129
	Rutherford County	15.3	584	3.5	-2.5	13.2	16.0	112
	Perquimans County	15.7	139	3.8	3.0	29.2	19.3	46
	Montgomery County	15.7	236	3.9	-6.7	30.9	14.0	55
	Swain County	15.7	120	3.6	7.1	33.7	15.3	25
	Richmond County	16.0	411	3.4	-7.8	35.2	13.6	98

TABLE A.6 (Continued)
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR ALAMANCE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA

County	Similarity Index	Similarity Index Components					
		Elderly FSP Participants					
		Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Onslow County	16.1	537	3.8	-0.2	27.9	6.3	196
Currituck County	16.5	57	1.6	-10.9	9.6	12.0	69
Pender County	16.5	368	4.5	-9.4	27.3	14.1	47
Wilkes County	16.6	562	3.7	6.0	7.0	14.1	87
Beaufort County	16.7	565	4.7	-1.1	31.6	15.9	54
Henderson County	17.0	622	2.2	-0.5	7.5	21.7	238
Caldwell County	17.1	537	3.2	11.4	8.3	13.3	164
Surry County	17.3	695	4.0	5.0	9.6	15.4	133
New Hanover County	17.7	1,182	4.1	-3.3	20.1	12.8	806
Granville County	17.7	322	3.5	-2.4	39.3	11.4	91
Yadkin County	18.0	299	3.5	-6.0	7.5	14.2	108
Polk County	18.7	87	1.4	0.0	7.7	23.6	77
Wayne County	18.8	887	4.2	-0.6	38.7	11.6	205
Watauga County	18.8	181	2.4	-5.7	3.5	11.0	136
Haywood County	19.0	516	3.2	1.4	3.2	19.0	98
Wake County	19.3	1,990	3.0	3.1	27.6	7.4	753
Pamlico County	19.3	124	3.3	-13.3	26.8	18.8	38
Pasquotank County	19.4	393	4.9	0.3	43.1	14.1	154
Gates County	19.8	116	4.4	-1.7	40.9	14.4	31
Transylvania County	20.6	175	1.9	-6.9	6.3	21.4	78
Harnett County	20.8	770	5.1	-6.7	28.9	10.4	153
Dare County	21.5	69	1.2	23.2	5.3	13.8	78
Wilson County	21.5	711	4.5	-3.7	44.2	12.9	199
Caswell County	21.7	307	5.5	5.1	38.9	13.0	55
Franklin County	21.8	549	6.0	4.2	34.0	11.0	96
Avery County	22.0	219	5.2	2.8	6.0	15.7	70
Sampson County	22.3	645	5.0	-4.0	40.2	12.8	64
Vance County	22.9	431	4.5	0.2	51.8	12.6	169
Graham County	22.9	99	4.4	-2.0	8.1	18.0	27
Ashe County	23.1	275	3.8	-3.5	2.8	18.0	57
Durham County	23.4	725	2.0	-9.5	49.1	9.7	767
Stokes County	23.5	419	5.1	8.3	6.6	11.8	99
Nash County	23.8	980	5.4	-4.7	38.1	12.4	162
Alleghany County	24.6	131	3.9	8.3	4.3	19.2	45
Johnston County	24.7	1,308	6.7	-0.9	21.9	9.8	154
Washington County	24.9	157	4.3	-2.5	51.7	15.5	39
Chowan County	25.0	232	5.2	-4.5	39.5	17.9	84
Anson County	25.2	350	5.2	-1.7	50.5	14.4	48
Lenoir County	25.2	883	6.0	-1.9	43.5	14.6	149
Duplin County	25.3	634	6.0	-3.6	41.3	12.9	60

TABLE A.6 (Continued)
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR ALAMANCE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA

County	Similarity Index	Similarity Index Components					
		Elderly FSP Participants					
		Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pitt County	25.3	1,052	5.2	-4.5	37.9	9.6	205
Cherokee County	25.6	336	4.7	-2.9	5.2	19.7	53
Macon County	26.3	230	2.3	-12.2	2.8	22.4	58
Mitchell County	26.6	226	4.6	-3.8	2.1	18.6	71
Madison County	26.8	286	5.4	-4.7	2.4	15.9	44
Columbus County	27.0	856	6.8	-6.3	36.6	13.8	58
Martin County	27.9	451	6.7	-0.2	47.5	15.2	55
Jones County	28.3	194	7.5	-1.0	39.0	15.4	22
Scotland County	29.2	400	5.7	-5.7	48.5	11.3	113
Cumberland County	29.3	1,529	4.3	-4.4	44.8	7.7	464
Yancey County	30.0	314	6.3	-1.6	2.0	18.2	57
Tyrrell County	30.3	89	7.2	-1.1	43.5	16.1	11
Warren County	30.5	302	5.1	1.3	61.1	17.4	47
Clay County	30.8	118	4.3	11.3	2.0	22.7	41
Mecklenburg County	31.2	2,806	3.0	11.1	36.0	8.6	1320
Hyde County	31.7	143	8.5	-0.7	37.3	16.4	10
Greene County	35.1	252	7.0	-11.0	48.2	12.1	72
Edgecombe County	35.5	921	7.1	0.5	59.9	12.5	110
Hoke County	36.9	244	5.9	-7.6	55.5	7.7	86
Bladen County	39.0	764	10.0	-7.2	42.8	14.2	37
Halifax County	39.5	1,248	8.3	-1.1	57.4	14.9	79
Hertford County	41.6	508	8.3	-5.4	62.6	15.8	64
Northampton County	41.6	591	8.9	3.3	60.9	17.4	41
Bertie County	44.9	543	9.6	-2.2	63.7	16.0	28
Robeson County	45.4	1,628	7.6	-1.6	67.2	10.0	130
Mean		530	4	-1	26.6	14.2	166
Median		400	4	-2	25.1	13.8	98
Min		49	1	-13	2.0	6.3	10
Max		2,806	10	23	67.2	23.6	1,320

5. Connecticut

The process to select comparison sites for Connecticut's commodity alternative demonstration involved more steps than the process in other states because Connecticut's pilot is implemented in multiple towns as opposed to just one or two counties. The Community Resource Team (CRT) in Hartford will be operating the demonstration. The CRT runs local Meals on Wheels (MOW) and congregate meal programs, and the demonstration builds upon these existing programs. There are 19 towns in the Hartford area – including the city of Hartford – that have both MOW and congregate meal programs operated by the CRT. The Connecticut commodity alternative demonstration is designed to implement the commodity alternative in 10 of these towns.

The Connecticut demonstration provides a unique opportunity to randomly select pilot towns from a larger pool of towns that are located in the same metropolitan area. However, because we also want to compare the outcomes of the Connecticut demonstration with the outcomes in other states, we want to ensure that the comparisons made in Connecticut are comparable to those made in the other states. As a result, we recommend three sets of comparisons to explore the impact of Connecticut's demonstration. The first is to compare the participation patterns in the 10 pilot sites with the remaining sites in the Hartford area (referred to as the Hartford region comparison sites). The second is to compare the 10 pilot sites with similar sites selected from throughout the state regardless of the availability congregate meal and MOW services. The third is to compare the 10 pilot sites with similar sites throughout the state that have both congregate meals and MOW services.

MPR worked with the demonstration staff to select the 10 pilot sites from the 19 potential comparison sites. First, Hartford was assigned to the pilot group due to its size. The town of New Haven was selected as the comparison site for Hartford because no other Hartford area

town could serve as a reasonable comparison site. New Haven has both congregate meals and MOW services. Nine of the remaining 18 towns were then randomly selected to be pilot sites. Because the pool of potential pilot sites is small, and because comparisons will be made between the nine pilot towns (excluding Hartford) and the nine Hartford region comparison towns, we wanted to ensure that the pilot towns resemble the comparison towns. To do this, we constructed nine pairs of towns where each pair contained two towns that were similar to each other (similarity was measured using the similarity index). We then randomly selected one town from each pair to be a pilot site and the other to be a Hartford region comparison site.[7] Table A.7 shows the 10 pilot and 10 corresponding Hartford region comparison sites.

The final 10 pilot sites (including Hartford) resemble the 10 Hartford region comparison sites. The average pilot site has 407 elderly FSP participants, reflecting, on average, 4.4 percent of the site's elderly population. The average comparison site has 327 participants, reflecting 3.2 percent of the town's elderly population. The average pilot site is 14.2 percent nonwhite and the average comparison site is 14.5 percent nonwhite. The average pilot site has 2,036 people per square mile and the average comparison site has 2,025 people per square mile. While the average pilot site experienced an four percent increase in elderly FSP participation, the average

[7]One pair contained the towns of West Hartford and New Britain. The process randomly selected West Hartford as a pilot site and New Britain as a Hartford region comparison site. Based on the preferences of the state, we changed this to make New Britain the pilot site and West Hartford the comparison site. While this diminishes the randomness of the selection process, it retains the similarities between the 9 pilot and 9 comparison sites.

TABLE A.7
SELECTION OF PILOT AND HARTFORD REGION COMPARISON SITES IN CONNECTICUT

Pair Number	Town	Group	Elderly FSP Participants			Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
			Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation			
1	Hartford	Pilot	2,695	21.1	0.3	78.3	9.8	7553
1	New Haven	Comparison	1,902	13.1	0.0	57.8	11.8	6529
2	Hebron	Comparison	3	0.6	-50.0	3.1	6.0	220
2	Stafford	Pilot	35	2.4	2.9	4.3	12.2	203
3	South Windsor	Pilot	28	1.2	7.7	8.9	10.4	809
3	Southington	Comparison	81	1.6	-4.7	3.9	13.4	1067
4	Enfield	Pilot	68	1.3	-5.6	7.7	12.8	1271
4	Plymouth	Comparison	22	1.4	15.8	2.3	12.8	556
5	Berlin	Comparison	20	0.7	0.0	4.2	16.8	655
5	East Windsor	Pilot	29	2.2	11.5	8.8	13.5	379
6	Bristol	Comparison	200	2.4	-8.7	7.6	14.3	2234
6	Windsor	Pilot	100	2.5	-2.0	27.2	14.7	930
7	Manchester	Pilot	197	2.5	1.0	11.0	15.1	1882
7	Vernon	Comparison	101	2.6	18.8	8.7	12.8	1675
8	Windsor Locks	Pilot	29	1.5	20.8	6.7	16.3	1325
8	Newington	Comparison	67	1.3	6.3	7.2	18.8	2138
9	East Hartford	Comparison	341	4.4	0.9	22.3	16.5	2630
9	Bloomfield	Pilot	111	2.9	0.0	49.6	20.3	731
10	West Hartford	Comparison	537	4.3	3.7	11.7	22.4	2548
10	New Britain	Pilot	781	6.7	3.3	32.9	16.6	5273
	Average	Pilot	407	4.4	4.0	23.5	14.2	2036
	Average	Comparison	327	3.2	-1.8	12.9	14.5	2025

[a]July 2001

comparison site experienced a decline in elderly FSP participation. However, this is driven by the comparison town of Hebron, where elderly FSP population declined by 50 percent, from 6 people to 3 people. Among the other 9 comparison sites, participation increased by an average of 3.6 percent. The main difference between pilot and comparison sites is that the pilot sites have, on average, proportionately more nonwhite residents. Of the five towns that are more than 25 percent nonwhite, New Haven is the only site selected in the comparison group; the other four towns are pilot sites.[8]

The Hartford region comparison sites will be used to determine whether the demonstration had an impact on FSP participation in the pilot sites relative to similar towns with congregate meals and MOW. Given that trends in elderly FSP participation can be affected both by characteristics idiosyncratic to the Hartford region and by the congregate meal and MOW programs, this comparison group may be the best measure of whether the demonstration affects elderly FSP participation since all sites have those characteristics in common. However, because comparison sites in the other demonstration states were selected with a different methodology, the analysis of the Hartford region comparison sites will not be comparable to the analyses in other states. To generate results that can be compared with the other states, we created a second set of comparison sites using the methodology we used in the other states.

Because there are 10 pilot sites in Connecticut, and because the characteristics of these pilot sites differ, we set out to identify more than the maximum 10 comparison sites for Connecticut. For each pilot site, we identified 5 similar comparison sites using the similarity index

[8]The discrepancy between pilot and comparison sites in terms of size of the nonwhite population is not driven by the fact that New Britain was not randomly selected as a pilot site, although it does contribute to the discrepancy.

methodology. [9] The union of all similar sites (a total of 42 sites) became our pool of statewide comparison sites (Table A.8).

One of the primary differences between the Hartford region comparison sites and the state-wide comparison sites is that all the Hartford region sites have both congregate meal and MOW programs while the state-wide comparison sites may not. Thus, to better understand any differences in findings from these two comparison groups, we created a third comparison group that is drawn from all towns in the state that have both congregate meals and MOW. This comparison group was drawn using the similarity index methodology. For each pilot site, we identified five similar comparison sites from the congregate meal and MOW towns. The union of those sites is the state-wide congregate meal/MOW comparison group (Table A.9).

Combined, the three groups of comparison sites in Connecticut can be used to determine whether the demonstration has any impact relative to similar Hartford-area towns, whether it has an impact relative to all towns that have congregate meals and MOW, and whether it has an impact relative to all towns in the state. For each comparison group, we recommend that the evaluators compare the average change in participation in the pilot sites with the average adjusted change in participation in the comparison sites. To better understand these patterns, we also recommend that the evaluators compare each pilot site with the specific comparison sites selected for that site. (Tables A.10 through A.19 present the similarity indices for each of the 10 pilot towns.)

[9]Based on discussions with staff from Connecticut, the towns of Glastonbury and Naugatuck are deemed inappropriate comparison towns and are not included in any comparison group, despite low similarity index scores.

TABLE A.8
CONNECTICUT PILOT AND STATEWIDE COMPARISON TOWNS

	Similarity Index Components					
	Elderly Participants					
	Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot Towns						
Bloomfield	105	2.7	-4.5	49.6	20.3	731
East Windsor	31	2.3	19.2	8.8	13.5	379
Enfield	70	1.3	2.9	7.7	12.8	1,271
Hartford	2,486	19.5	2.5	78.3	9.8	7,553
Manchester	204	2.6	5.7	11.0	15.1	1,882
New Britain	726	6.2	3.0	32.9	16.6	5,273
South Windsor	30	1.3	20.0	8.9	10.4	809
Stafford	31	2.2	-6.1	4.3	12.2	203
Windsor	89	2.2	-13.6	27.2	14.7	930
Windsor Locks	26	1.3	23.8	6.7	16.3	1,325
Average	380	4.2	5.3	23.5	14.2	2,036
State-Wide Comparison Towns						
Bridgeport	1,654	9.2	-7.6	62.4	13.2	8,548
Bristol	195	2.3	-8.5	7.6	14.3	2,234
Canton	6	0.7	20.0	3.4	11.3	329
Cheshire	38	1.1	5.6	11.5	12.9	788
Clinton	20	1.4	0.0	6.9	10.8	807
Colchester	28	2.2	16.7	4.0	9.7	272
Cromwell	25	1.2	8.7	7.0	16.0	1,008
Derby	49	2.2	-12.5	10.3	18.6	2,390
East Granby	8	1.6	-20.0	4.3	11.6	253
East Hartford	312	4.0	-3.4	22.3	16.5	2,630
East Haven	138	3.1	2.2	4.6	16.4	2,178
Farmington	56	1.7	7.7	6.6	15.8	751
Guilford	32	1.3	-5.9	3.8	12.5	425
Hamden	202	1.9	0.0	15.2	19.9	1,631
Lebanon	9	1.5	28.6	3.3	9.4	120
Meriden	392	4.6	0.8	22.7	15.2	2,377
Middletown	175	3.2	-9.8	19.2	12.4	1,060
Milford	133	1.7	2.3	6.6	15.3	2,208
Montville	37	1.9	-7.5	10.1	11.2	411
New Haven	1,702	11.8	-2.4	57.8	11.8	6,529
New London	278	9.2	1.1	39.3	12.7	4,307
Plainville	52	2.1	4.0	7.4	15.0	1,724
Plymouth	19	1.2	5.6	2.3	12.8	556
Pomfret	9	2.0	12.5	1.9	13.4	84

[a]September 2001

TABLE A.8 (Continued)
CONNECTICUT PILOT AND STATEWIDE COMPARISON TOWNS

	Similarity Index Components					
	Elderly Participants[a]	Elderly Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Portland	18	1.3	5.9	5.1	15.6	378
Putnam	48	3.1	-5.9	4.0	17.4	438
Ridgefield	17	0.7	6.3	4.9	10.8	639
Rocky Hill	26	1.0	30.0	8.6	15.7	1,227
Seymour	36	1.7	-16.3	4.2	14.8	970
Shelton	63	1.2	6.8	6.5	13.4	1,234
Simsbury	23	0.8	21.1	5.1	12.7	642
Southington	74	1.4	-11.9	3.9	13.4	1,067
Stamford	768	5.0	7.0	35.7	14.0	2,937
Stratford	136	1.4	6.3	14.6	19.9	2,787
Torrington	123	1.9	3.4	5.2	18.2	872
Trumbull	61	1.1	13.0	6.7	16.9	1,454
Vernon	93	2.4	9.4	8.7	12.8	1,675
Wallingford	74	1.2	-15.9	6.5	15.2	1,046
Waterbury	1,076	6.2	2.6	31.8	16.5	3,689
West Haven	310	4.0	0.6	23.4	15.1	4,749
Winchester	27	1.6	-6.9	3.0	14.5	353
Windham	203	8.3	-1.9	24.7	11.3	796
Average	208	2.8	2.2	12.9	14.2	1,680

[a]September 2001

TABLE A.9
CONNECTICUT PILOT AND SERVICE ENVIRONMENT COMPARISON TOWNS

	Similarity Index Components					
	Elderly FSP Participants					
	Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot Towns						
Bloomfield	105	2.7	-4.5	49.6	20.3	731
East Windsor	31	2.3	19.2	8.8	13.5	379
Enfield	70	1.3	2.9	7.7	12.8	1,271
Hartford	2,486	19.5	2.5	78.3	9.8	7,553
Manchester	204	2.6	5.7	11.0	15.1	1,882
New Britain	726	6.2	3.0	32.9	16.6	5,273
South Windsor	30	1.3	20.0	8.9	10.4	809
Stafford	31	2.2	-6.1	4.3	12.2	203
Windsor	89	2.2	-13.6	27.2	14.7	930
Windsor Locks	26	1.3	23.8	6.7	16.3	1,325
Average	380	4.2	5.3	23.5	14.2	2,036
Service Environment Comparison Towns						
Berlin	24	0.8	33	4.2	16.8	655
Bridgeport	1,654	9.2	-8	62.4	13.2	8548
Bristol	195	2.3	-8	7.6	14.3	2234
Brookfield	22	1.5	-12	5.2	10.0	737
Clinton	20	1.4	0	6.9	10.8	807
Cromwell	25	1.2	9	7.0	16.0	1008
Derby	49	2.2	-13	10.3	18.6	2390
East Haddam	12	1.3	9	3.0	12.0	137
East Hartford	312	4.0	-3	22.3	16.5	2630
East Haven	138	3.1	2	4.6	16.4	2178
Hamden	202	1.9	0	15.2	19.9	1631
Lebanon	9	1.5	29	3.3	9.4	120
Meriden	392	4.6	1	22.7	15.2	2377
Middletown	175	3.2	-10	19.2	12.4	1060
Milford	133	1.7	2	6.6	15.3	2208
Montville	37	1.9	-8	10.1	11.2	411
New Haven	1,702	11.8	-2	57.8	11.8	6529
New London	278	9.2	1	39.3	12.7	4307
North Branford	22	1.3	-19	3.8	11.8	557
North Haven	49	1.2	29	7.0	19.2	1059
Plainfield	57	3.3	-12	3.3	12.1	343
Plainville	52	2.1	4	7.4	15.0	1724

[a]September 2001

TABLE A.9 (Continued)
CONNECTICUT PILOT AND SERVICE ENVIRONMENT COMPARISON TOWNS

	Similarity Index Components					
	Elderly FSP Participants					
	Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Plymouth	19	1.2	6	2.3	12.8	556
Pomfret	9	2.0	13	1.9	13.4	84
Portland	18	1.3	6	5.1	15.6	378
Putnam	48	3.1	-6	4.0	17.4	438
Seymour	36	1.7	-16	4.2	14.8	970
Southington	74	1.4	-12	3.9	13.4	1067
Stamford	768	5.0	7	35.7	14.0	2937
Thomaston	13	1.3	0	2.1	13.6	610
Torrington	123	1.9	3	5.2	18.2	872
Trumbull	61	1.1	13	6.7	16.9	1454
Vernon	93	2.4	9	8.7	12.8	1675
Wallingford	74	1.2	-16	6.5	15.2	1046
Waterbury	1076	6.2	3	31.8	16.5	3689
West Haven	310	4.0	1	23.4	15.1	4749
Windham	203	8.3	-2	24.7	11.3	796
Windsor	89	2.2	-14	27.2	14.7	930
Average	226	3.0	0.5	13.8	14.4	1,734

[a]September 2001

TABLE A.10
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR BLOOMFIELD, CONNECTICUT

	Similarity Index	Congregate Meals and MOW?	State-Wide Comparison Sites	State-Wide Congregate Meal/MOW Sites	Similarity Index Components: Elderly FSP Participants: Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot Town										
Bloomfield	0.0	Yes			105	2.7	-4.5	49.6	20.3	731
Other Towns										
Hamden	7.5	Yes	1	1	202	1.9	0.0	15.2	19.9	1,631
Windsor	7.8	Yes	2	2	89	2.2	-13.6	27.2	14.7	930
Derby	8.7	Yes	3	3	49	2.2	-12.5	10.3	18.6	2,390
Putnam	8.7	Yes	4	4	48	3.1	-5.9	4.0	17.4	438
Torrington	8.8	Yes	5	5	123	1.9	3.4	5.2	18.2	872
Stratford	9.0	Yes			136	1.4	6.3	14.6	19.9	2,787
Waterford	9.2	Yes			36	1.0	0.0	7.6	20.1	555
Ansonia	9.5	Yes			103	3.6	-4.6	14.8	16.3	2,937
Stonington	10.0	Yes			58	2.0	7.4	3.8	17.3	442
Manchester	10.0	Yes			204	2.6	5.7	11.0	15.1	1,882
Westbrook	10.1	Yes			19	1.9	-20.8	4.2	18.4	355
East Haven	10.1	Yes			138	3.1	2.2	4.6	16.4	2,178
Middletown	10.4	Yes			175	3.2	-9.8	19.2	12.4	1,060
Orange	10.5	Yes			15	0.6	-6.3	6.2	19.2	719
Greenwich	10.5	Yes			83	0.8	5.1	14.2	17.3	1,218
East Hartford	10.6	Yes			312	4.0	-3.4	22.3	16.5	2,630
Newington	10.7	Yes			72	1.4	14.3	7.2	18.8	2,138
Wethersfield	10.8	No			98	1.7	5.4	5.4	23.7	2,016
Thompson	10.9	No			29	2.0	0.0	2.0	15.9	192
Farmington	10.9	No			56	1.7	7.7	6.6	15.8	751
Groton	10.9	Yes			107	2.5	-6.1	16.0	10.4	1,328
Plainville	11.0	Yes			52	2.1	4.0	7.4	15.0	1,724
Old Saybrook	11.1	Yes			9	0.4	0.0	4.9	21.2	646
North Haven	11.3	Yes			49	1.2	28.9	7.0	19.2	1,059
Bristol	11.3	Yes			195	2.3	-8.5	7.6	14.3	2,234
Vernon	11.5	Yes			93	2.4	9.4	8.7	12.8	1,675
Branford	11.5	Yes			59	1.3	-14.5	5.7	16.2	1,238
Milford	11.5	Yes			133	1.7	2.3	6.6	15.3	2,208
Norwalk	11.6	Yes			367	3.5	-1.9	31.4	13.3	3,414
Woodbridge	11.6	Yes			10	0.7	-9.1	8.1	17.2	428
Cromwell	11.9	Yes			25	1.2	8.7	7.0	16.0	1,008
Essex	11.9	Yes			12	0.9	9.1	3.1	22.6	595
East Windsor	12.0	Yes			31	2.3	19.2	8.8	13.5	379
Seymour	12.0	Yes			36	1.7	-16.3	4.2	14.8	970
Winchester	12.0	No			27	1.6	-6.9	3.0	14.5	353
Trumbull	12.0	Yes			61	1.1	13.0	6.7	16.9	1,454
Wallingford	12.1	Yes			74	1.2	-15.9	6.5	15.2	1,046
Glastonbury	12.1	No			63	1.6	5.0	7.7	13.4	560
Danbury	12.1	Yes			299	3.8	-1.6	23.7	12.0	1,551
Portland	12.2	Yes			18	1.3	5.9	5.1	15.6	378
Cornwall	12.3	Yes			1	0.4	0.0	3.2	18.7	33
Stafford	12.3	Yes			31	2.2	-6.1	4.3	12.2	203
Fairfield	12.5	Yes			52	0.5	-17.5	5.3	18.0	1,781
Eastford	12.5	Yes			3	1.4	0.0	2.8	15.4	50
Naugatuck	12.6	Yes			80	2.3	5.3	7.8	11.5	1,842
Plainfield	12.6	Yes			57	3.3	-12.3	3.3	12.1	343
Montville	12.6	Yes			37	1.9	-7.5	10.1	11.2	411
Windsor Locks	12.7	Yes			26	1.3	23.8	6.7	16.3	1,325
Suffield	12.7	Yes			17	1.0	-5.6	4.8	14.9	264
Southington	12.9	Yes			74	1.4	-11.9	3.9	13.4	1,067
West Haven	12.9	Yes			310	4.0	0.6	23.4	15.1	4,749
Killingly	12.9	Yes			106	4.7	-4.5	4.0	14.1	332
Westport	12.9	Yes			16	0.4	-5.9	6.8	15.9	1,206
Chester	13.0	Yes			5	0.8	0.0	3.6	15.8	239
Union	13.0	No			1	0.9	0.0	2.2	16.2	24
Cheshire	13.0	Yes			38	1.1	5.6	11.5	12.9	788

TABLE A.11
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR EAST WINDSOR, CONNECTICUT

	Similarity Index	Congregate Meals and MOW?	State-Wide Comparison Sites	State-Wide Congregate Meal/MOW Sites	Similarity Index Components: Elderly FSP Participants: Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot Town										
East Windsor	0.0	Yes			31	2.3	19.2	8.8	13.5	379
Other Towns										
Pomfret	2.2	Yes	1	1	9	2.0	12.5	1.9	13.4	84
Vernon	2.5	Yes	2	2	93	2.4	9.4	8.7	12.8	1,675
Glastonbury	2.5	No	3		63	1.6	5.0	7.7	13.4	560
Stafford	3.2	Yes	(pilot)	(pilot)	31	2.2	-6.1	4.3	12.2	203
Colchester	3.3	No	4		28	2.2	16.7	4.0	9.7	272
Naugatuck	3.4	Yes	(Excluded)	(Excluded)	80	2.3	5.3	7.8	11.5	1,842
Plainville	3.4	Yes	5	3	52	2.1	4.0	7.4	15.0	1,724
Shelton	3.7	No			63	1.2	6.8	6.5	13.4	1,234
Farmington	3.8	No			56	1.7	7.7	6.6	15.8	751
Simsbury	3.8	No			23	0.8	21.1	5.1	12.7	642
Cheshire	3.8	Yes		4	38	1.1	5.6	11.5	12.9	788
Montville	3.9	Yes		5	37	1.9	-7.5	10.1	11.2	411
South Windsor	4.0	Yes			30	1.3	20.0	8.9	10.4	809
Preston	4.0	No			9	1.2	12.5	5.7	15.1	163
Thompson	4.0	No			29	2.0	0.0	2.0	15.9	192
Thomaston	4.1	Yes			13	1.3	0.0	2.1	13.6	610
Plymouth	4.1	Yes			19	1.2	5.6	2.3	12.8	556
Winchester	4.1	No			27	1.6	-6.9	3.0	14.5	353
Wolcott	4.1	Yes			21	1.0	10.5	4.1	14.4	699
Enfield	4.2	Yes			70	1.3	2.9	7.7	12.8	1,271
East Haddam	4.2	Yes			12	1.3	9.1	3.0	12.0	137
Prospect	4.3	Yes			10	0.8	25.0	4.8	14.6	574
Canterbury	4.4	Yes			11	2.4	37.5	2.7	9.9	117
Portland	4.4	Yes			18	1.3	5.9	5.1	15.6	378
Stonington	4.4	Yes			58	2.0	7.4	3.8	17.3	442
Somers	4.5	No			9	0.8	12.5	11.2	11.9	325
Windsor Locks	4.5	Yes			26	1.3	23.8	6.7	16.3	1,325
Griswold	4.5	Yes			44	3.5	10.0	3.3	11.7	308
Guilford	4.5	No			32	1.3	-5.9	3.8	12.5	425
Bristol	4.6	Yes			195	2.3	-8.5	7.6	14.3	2,234
Cromwell	4.6	Yes			25	1.2	8.7	7.0	16.0	1,008
Southington	4.8	Yes			74	1.4	-11.9	3.9	13.4	1,067
Rocky Hill	4.8	No			26	1.0	30.0	8.6	15.7	1,227
Manchester	4.8	Yes			204	2.6	5.7	11.0	15.1	1,882
Seymour	4.9	Yes			36	1.7	-16.3	4.2	14.8	970
Clinton	4.9	Yes			20	1.4	0.0	6.9	10.8	807
Kent	4.9	No			4	0.9	33.3	7.3	15.1	64
Madison	5.0	No			13	0.6	30.0	3.4	14.2	447
Eastford	5.1	Yes			3	1.4	0.0	2.8	15.4	50
Canton	5.1	No			6	0.7	20.0	3.4	11.3	329
Wilton	5.2	Yes			5	0.2	25.0	5.2	12.8	613
Suffield	5.2	Yes			17	1.0	-5.6	4.8	14.9	264
New Milford	5.2	Yes			42	1.7	-4.5	6.2	9.6	417
Milford	5.2	Yes			133	1.7	2.3	6.6	15.3	2,208
Plainfield	5.2	Yes			57	3.3	-12.3	3.3	12.1	343
Bozrah	5.3	Yes			5	1.5	66.7	2.8	13.6	119
Woodstock	5.4	Yes			7	0.8	0.0	1.5	14.0	108
Harwinton	5.4	Yes			4	0.6	33.3	1.2	13.0	174
Lebanon	5.4	Yes			9	1.5	28.6	3.3	9.4	120
Brooklyn	5.5	Yes			8	0.9	-20.0	7.7	13.0	241
East Granby	5.5	No			8	1.6	-20.0	4.3	11.6	253
Scotland	5.5	Yes			1	0.5	0.0	2.9	13.3	77
Mansfield	5.6	Yes			26	1.7	30.0	17.2	8.7	393
Darien	5.6	Yes			9	0.3	28.6	6.1	14.3	1,413
Watertown	5.6	Yes			31	1.0	-13.9	3.9	14.4	743
Marlborough	5.6	No			11	2.5	0.0	3.5	7.8	245
Groton	5.7	Yes			107	2.5	-6.1	16.0	10.4	1,328

TABLE A.12
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR ENFIELD, CONNECTICUT

	Similarity Index	Congregate Meals and MOW?	State-Wide Comparison Sites	State-Wide Congregate Meal/MOW Sites	Similarity Index Components: Elderly FSP Participants: Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot Town										
Enfield	0.0	Yes			70	1.3	2.9	7.7	12.8	1,271
Other Towns										
Shelton	0.9	No	1		63	1.2	6.8	6.5	13.4	1,234
Cheshire	1.5	Yes	2	1	38	1.1	5.6	11.5	12.9	788
Glastonbury	1.6	No	(Excluded)	(Excluded)	63	1.6	5.0	7.7	13.4	560
Plymouth	1.8	Yes	3	2	19	1.2	5.6	2.3	12.8	556
Guilford	2.0	No	4		32	1.3	-5.9	3.8	12.5	425
Southington	2.1	Yes	5	3	74	1.4	-11.9	3.9	13.4	1,067
Thomaston	2.2	Yes		4	13	1.3	0.0	2.1	13.6	610
Clinton	2.3	Yes		5	20	1.4	0.0	6.9	10.8	807
East Haddam	2.6	Yes			12	1.3	9.1	3.0	12.0	137
Cromwell	2.9	Yes			25	1.2	8.7	7.0	16.0	1,008
Simsbury	3.0	No			23	0.8	21.1	5.1	12.7	642
Vernon	3.0	Yes			93	2.4	9.4	8.7	12.8	1,675
Wolcott	3.0	Yes			21	1.0	10.5	4.1	14.4	699
Wallingford	3.1	Yes			74	1.2	-15.9	6.5	15.2	1,046
Naugatuck	3.1	Yes			80	2.3	5.3	7.8	11.5	1,842
South Windsor	3.2	Yes			30	1.3	20.0	8.9	10.4	809
Portland	3.2	Yes			18	1.3	5.9	5.1	15.6	378
North Branford	3.2	Yes			22	1.3	-18.5	3.8	11.8	557
Plainville	3.2	Yes			52	2.1	4.0	7.4	15.0	1,724
Columbia	3.3	Yes			5	0.9	0.0	3.3	11.6	231
Farmington	3.3	No			56	1.7	7.7	6.6	15.8	751
Brooklyn	3.3	Yes			8	0.9	-20.0	7.7	13.0	241
Bethlehem	3.4	Yes			5	1.2	-16.7	2.0	12.3	170
Somers	3.4	No			9	0.8	12.5	11.2	11.9	325
Branford	3.5	Yes			59	1.3	-14.5	5.7	16.2	1,238
Ellington	3.5	No			12	0.9	0.0	3.5	10.7	347
Ridgefield	3.5	No			17	0.7	6.3	4.9	10.8	639
Milford	3.5	Yes			133	1.7	2.3	6.6	15.3	2,208
Preston	3.5	No			9	1.2	12.5	5.7	15.1	163
Watertown	3.6	Yes			31	1.0	-13.9	3.9	14.4	743
Suffield	3.6	Yes			17	1.0	-5.6	4.8	14.9	264
Scotland	3.7	Yes			1	0.5	0.0	2.9	13.3	77
Winchester	3.7	No			27	1.6	-6.9	3.0	14.5	353
Eastford	3.7	Yes			3	1.4	0.0	2.8	15.4	50
Trumbull	3.7	Yes			61	1.1	13.0	6.7	16.9	1,454
Montville	3.7	Yes			37	1.9	-7.5	10.1	11.2	411
Stafford	3.8	Yes			31	2.2	-6.1	4.3	12.2	203
Woodstock	3.8	Yes			7	0.8	0.0	1.5	14.0	108
Beacon Falls	3.8	Yes			8	1.4	-11.1	2.6	10.7	528
Windsor Locks	3.9	Yes			26	1.3	23.8	6.7	16.3	1,325
Brookfield	3.9	Yes			22	1.5	-12.0	5.2	10.0	737
New Milford	3.9	Yes			42	1.7	-4.5	6.2	9.6	417
Seymour	4.0	Yes			36	1.7	-16.3	4.2	14.8	970
East Granby	4.0	No			8	1.6	-20.0	4.3	11.6	253
Pomfret	4.0	Yes			9	2.0	12.5	1.9	13.4	84
Chaplin	4.0	Yes			1	0.4	0.0	2.4	12.1	115
Granby	4.1	No			9	0.9	0.0	3.0	10.1	236
Redding	4.1	Yes			3	0.3	0.0	4.9	11.5	258
East Windsor	4.2	Yes			31	2.3	19.2	8.8	13.5	379
Woodbury	4.2	Yes			8	0.7	-11.1	3.9	13.9	236
Rocky Hill	4.3	No			26	1.0	30.0	8.6	15.7	1,227
Goshen	4.3	Yes			2	0.6	0.0	2.2	14.4	56
Wilton	4.4	Yes			5	0.2	25.0	5.2	12.8	613
Prospect	4.4	Yes			10	0.8	25.0	4.8	14.6	574
Bolton	4.4	No			1	0.2	0.0	4.3	11.4	333
Chester	4.4	Yes			5	0.8	0.0	3.6	15.8	239

TABLE A.13
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR HARTFORD CONNECTICUT

					Similarity Index Components					
					Elderly FSP Participants					
	Similarity Index	Congregate Meals and MOW?	State-Wide Comparison Sites	State-Wide Congregate Meal/MOW Sites	Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot Town										
Hartford	0.0	Yes			2,486	19.5	2.5	78.3	9.8	7,553
Other Towns										
New Haven	24.0	Yes	1	1	1,702	11.8	-2.4	57.8	11.8	6,529
Bridgeport	29.4	Yes	2	2	1,654	9.2	-7.6	62.4	13.2	8,548
New London	43.0	Yes	3	3	278	9.2	1.1	39.3	12.7	4,307
Waterbury	45.9	Yes	4	4	1,076	6.2	2.6	31.8	16.5	3,689
New Britain	47.3	Yes	(pilot)	(pilot)	726	6.2	3.0	32.9	16.6	5,273
Windham	48.3	Yes	5	5	203	8.3	-1.9	24.7	11.3	796
Stamford	49.0	Yes			768	5.0	7.0	35.7	14.0	2,937
Norwalk	54.3	Yes			367	3.5	-1.9	31.4	13.3	3,414
West Haven	54.9	Yes			310	4.0	0.6	23.4	15.1	4,749
Meriden	55.0	Yes			392	4.6	0.8	22.7	15.2	2,377
Danbury	55.6	Yes			299	3.8	-1.6	23.7	12.0	1,551
Norwich	57.3	Yes			276	4.9	4.9	13.4	15.6	1,262
East Hartford	57.5	Yes			312	4.0	-3.4	22.3	16.5	2,630
Middletown	59.1	Yes			175	3.2	-9.8	19.2	12.4	1,060
Groton	59.8	Yes			107	2.5	-6.1	16.0	10.4	1,328
Killingly	60.2	Yes			106	4.7	-4.5	4.0	14.1	332
West Hartford	60.2	Yes			521	4.2	2.4	11.7	22.4	2,548
Ansonia	60.5	Yes			103	3.6	-4.6	14.8	16.3	2,937
Voluntown	60.6	Yes			11	4.4	22.2	1.8	10.9	59
Naugatuck	61.3	Yes			80	2.3	5.3	7.8	11.5	1,842
Bloomfield	61.3	Yes			105	2.7	-4.5	49.6	20.3	731
Sprague	61.4	Yes			14	4.3	40.0	4.7	11.0	223
Griswold	61.4	Yes			44	3.5	10.0	3.3	11.7	308
Manchester	61.6	Yes			204	2.6	5.7	11.0	15.1	1,882
Vernon	62.0	Yes			93	2.4	9.4	8.7	12.8	1,675
Windsor	62.2	Yes			89	2.2	-13.6	27.2	14.7	930
Plainfield	62.3	Yes			57	3.3	-12.3	3.3	12.1	343
East Haven	62.3	Yes			138	3.1	2.2	4.6	16.4	2,178
Bristol	62.3	Yes			195	2.3	-8.5	7.6	14.3	2,234
New Milford	63.0	Yes			42	1.7	-4.5	6.2	9.6	417
Colchester	63.0	No			28	2.2	16.7	4.0	9.7	272
Montville	63.1	Yes			37	1.9	-7.5	10.1	11.2	411
Marlborough	63.1	No			11	2.5	0.0	3.5	7.8	245
Bethel	63.4	Yes			32	1.9	-23.8	7.6	9.4	1,063
Mansfield	63.5	Yes			26	1.7	30.0	17.2	8.7	393
Clinton	63.6	Yes			20	1.4	0.0	6.9	10.8	807
Milford	63.9	Yes			133	1.7	2.3	6.6	15.3	2,208
Brookfield	63.9	Yes			22	1.5	-12.0	5.2	10.0	737
Plainville	64.1	Yes			52	2.1	4.0	7.4	15.0	1,724
Stafford	64.1	Yes			31	2.2	-6.1	4.3	12.2	203
Enfield	64.1	Yes			70	1.3	2.9	7.7	12.8	1,271
South Windsor	64.2	Yes			30	1.3	20.0	8.9	10.4	809
Canterbury	64.3	Yes			11	2.4	37.5	2.7	9.9	117
East Windsor	64.4	Yes			31	2.3	19.2	8.8	13.5	379
Glastonbury	64.5	No			63	1.6	5.0	7.7	13.4	560
Canaan*	64.6	Yes			5	3.5	-37.5	3.8	13.4	32
Cheshire	64.7	Yes			38	1.1	5.6	11.5	12.9	788
Coventry	64.8	Yes			15	1.4	-11.8	3.1	9.2	298
Beacon Falls	65.0	Yes			8	1.4	-11.1	2.6	10.7	528
Granby	65.0	No			9	0.9	0.0	3.0	10.1	236
Shelton	65.0	No			63	1.2	6.8	6.5	13.4	1,234
Ashford	65.2	Yes			3	0.8	0.0	4.7	9.3	101
Ellington	65.2	No			12	0.9	0.0	3.5	10.7	347
Hamden	65.3	Yes			202	1.9	0.0	15.2	19.9	1,631
Ridgefield	65.3	No			17	0.7	6.3	4.9	10.8	639
Putnam	65.3	Yes			48	3.1	-5.9	4.0	17.4	438

TABLE A.14
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR MANCHESTER, CONNECTICUT

					Similarity Index Components					
					Elderly FSP Participants					
	Similarity Index	Congregate Meals and MOW?	State-Wide Comparison Sites	State-Wide Congregate Meal/MOW Sites	Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot Town										
Manchester	0.0	Yes			204	2.6	5.7	11.0	15.1	1,882
Other Towns										
Bristol	2.6	Yes	1	1	195	2.3	-8.5	7.6	14.3	2,234
Plainville	2.8	Yes	2	2	52	2.1	4.0	7.4	15.0	1,724
Milford	3.1	Yes	3	3	133	1.7	2.3	6.6	15.3	2,208
Vernon	3.1	Yes	4	4	93	2.4	9.4	8.7	12.8	1,675
East Haven	3.3	Yes	5	5	138	3.1	2.2	4.6	16.4	2,178
Naugatuck	4.1	Yes			80	2.3	5.3	7.8	11.5	1,842
Farmington	4.5	No			56	1.7	7.7	6.6	15.8	751
Ansonia	4.8	Yes			103	3.6	-4.6	14.8	16.3	2,937
East Windsor	4.8	Yes			31	2.3	19.2	8.8	13.5	379
Glastonbury	5.1	No			63	1.6	5.0	7.7	13.4	560
Torrington	5.1	Yes			123	1.9	3.4	5.2	18.2	872
Hamden	5.1	Yes			202	1.9	0.0	15.2	19.9	1,631
Thompson	5.3	No			29	2.0	0.0	2.0	15.9	192
Middletown	5.3	Yes			175	3.2	-9.8	19.2	12.4	1,060
Derby	5.4	Yes			49	2.2	-12.5	10.3	18.6	2,390
Stonington	5.4	Yes			58	2.0	7.4	3.8	17.3	442
Groton	5.4	Yes			107	2.5	-6.1	16.0	10.4	1,328
Cromwell	5.5	Yes			25	1.2	8.7	7.0	16.0	1,008
Shelton	5.5	No			63	1.2	6.8	6.5	13.4	1,234
Norwich	5.6	Yes			276	4.9	4.9	13.4	15.6	1,262
Windsor	5.6	Yes			89	2.2	-13.6	27.2	14.7	930
Portland	5.7	Yes			18	1.3	5.9	5.1	15.6	378
Enfield	5.7	Yes			70	1.3	2.9	7.7	12.8	1,271
Seymour	5.7	Yes			36	1.7	-16.3	4.2	14.8	970
Putnam	5.8	Yes			48	3.1	-5.9	4.0	17.4	438
Wallingford	5.9	Yes			74	1.2	-15.9	6.5	15.2	1,046
Cheshire	5.9	Yes			38	1.1	5.6	11.5	12.9	788
Trumbull	6.0	Yes			61	1.1	13.0	6.7	16.9	1,454
Winchester	6.1	No			27	1.6	-6.9	3.0	14.5	353
Preston	6.1	No			9	1.2	12.5	5.7	15.1	163
Greenwich	6.2	Yes			83	0.8	5.1	14.2	17.3	1,218
Branford	6.2	Yes			59	1.3	-14.5	5.7	16.2	1,238
Windsor Locks	6.2	Yes			26	1.3	23.8	6.7	16.3	1,325
Pomfret	6.3	Yes			9	2.0	12.5	1.9	13.4	84
East Hartford	6.4	Yes			312	4.0	-3.4	22.3	16.5	2,630
Eastford	6.4	Yes			3	1.4	0.0	2.8	15.4	50
Stafford	6.4	Yes			31	2.2	-6.1	4.3	12.2	203
Wolcott	6.5	Yes			21	1.0	10.5	4.1	14.4	699
Newington	6.5	Yes			72	1.4	14.3	7.2	18.8	2,138
Southington	6.5	Yes			74	1.4	-11.9	3.9	13.4	1,067
Stratford	6.5	Yes			136	1.4	6.3	14.6	19.9	2,787
Rocky Hill	6.6	No			26	1.0	30.0	8.6	15.7	1,227
Montville	6.6	Yes			37	1.9	-7.5	10.1	11.2	411
Suffield	6.8	Yes			17	1.0	-5.6	4.8	14.9	264
West Haven	6.8	Yes			310	4.0	0.6	23.4	15.1	4,749
Danbury	6.9	Yes			299	3.8	-1.6	23.7	12.0	1,551
Thomaston	6.9	Yes			13	1.3	0.0	2.1	13.6	610
Meriden	6.9	Yes			392	4.6	0.8	22.7	15.2	2,377
Griswold	6.9	Yes			44	3.5	10.0	3.3	11.7	308
Plainfield	7.0	Yes			57	3.3	-12.3	3.3	12.1	343
Plymouth	7.1	Yes			19	1.2	5.6	2.3	12.8	556
Killingly	7.3	Yes			106	4.7	-4.5	4.0	14.1	332
Watertown	7.3	Yes			31	1.0	-13.9	3.9	14.4	743
Chester	7.3	Yes			5	0.8	0.0	3.6	15.8	239
Westport	7.3	Yes			16	0.4	-5.9	6.8	15.9	1,206
Clinton	7.6	Yes			20	1.4	0.0	6.9	10.8	807
Prospect	7.6	Yes			10	0.8	25.0	4.8	14.6	574

TABLE A.15
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR NEW BRITAIN, CONNECTICUT

					Similarity Index Components					
					Elderly FSP Participants					
	Similarity Index	Congregate Meals and MOW?	State-Wide Comparison Sites	State-Wide Congregate Meal/MOW Sites	Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot Town										
New Britain	0.0	Yes			726	6.2	3.0	32.9	16.6	5,273
Other Towns										
Waterbury	3.8	Yes	1	1	1,076	6.2	2.6	31.8	16.5	3,689
Stamford	6.1	Yes	2	2	768	5.0	7.0	35.7	14.0	2,937
Meriden	9.4	Yes	3	3	392	4.6	0.8	22.7	15.2	2,377
West Haven	9.5	Yes	4	4	310	4.0	0.6	23.4	15.1	4,749
East Hartford	10.3	Yes	5	5	312	4.0	-3.4	22.3	16.5	2,630
Norwalk	10.9	Yes			367	3.5	-1.9	31.4	13.3	3,414
Norwich	11.1	Yes			276	4.9	4.9	13.4	15.6	1,262
New London	12.3	Yes			278	9.2	1.1	39.3	12.7	4,307
West Hartford	13.0	Yes			521	4.2	2.4	11.7	22.4	2,548
Ansonia	13.5	Yes			103	3.6	-4.6	14.8	16.3	2,937
Danbury	13.8	Yes			299	3.8	-1.6	23.7	12.0	1,551
Windham	14.8	Yes			203	8.3	-1.9	24.7	11.3	796
East Haven	15.3	Yes			138	3.1	2.2	4.6	16.4	2,178
Killingly	15.8	Yes			106	4.7	-4.5	4.0	14.1	332
Manchester	16.0	Yes			204	2.6	5.7	11.0	15.1	1,882
Middletown	16.8	Yes			175	3.2	-9.8	19.2	12.4	1,060
Windsor	17.2	Yes			89	2.2	-13.6	27.2	14.7	930
Bristol	17.8	Yes			195	2.3	-8.5	7.6	14.3	2,234
Hamden	18.0	Yes			202	1.9	0.0	15.2	19.9	1,631
Putnam	18.1	Yes			48	3.1	-5.9	4.0	17.4	438
Milford	18.2	Yes			133	1.7	2.3	6.6	15.3	2,208
Bloomfield	18.2	Yes			105	2.7	-4.5	49.6	20.3	731
Plainville	18.6	Yes			52	2.1	4.0	7.4	15.0	1,724
Derby	18.7	Yes			49	2.2	-12.5	10.3	18.6	2,390
Stratford	18.8	Yes			136	1.4	6.3	14.6	19.9	2,787
Torrington	19.1	Yes			123	1.9	3.4	5.2	18.2	872
Vernon	19.1	Yes			93	2.4	9.4	8.7	12.8	1,675
Greenwich	19.6	Yes			83	0.8	5.1	14.2	17.3	1,218
Stonington	19.7	Yes			58	2.0	7.4	3.8	17.3	442
Farmington	19.7	No			56	1.7	7.7	6.6	15.8	751
Groton	19.9	Yes			107	2.5	-6.1	16.0	10.4	1,328
Griswold	19.9	Yes			44	3.5	10.0	3.3	11.7	308
Naugatuck	20.0	Yes			80	2.3	5.3	7.8	11.5	1,842
Voluntown	20.0	Yes			11	4.4	22.2	1.8	10.9	59
Thompson	20.1	No			29	2.0	0.0	2.0	15.9	192
Trumbull	20.3	Yes			61	1.1	13.0	6.7	16.9	1,454
Bridgeport	20.4	Yes			1,654	9.2	-7.6	62.4	13.2	8,548
Cromwell	20.4	Yes			25	1.2	8.7	7.0	16.0	1,008
Plainfield	20.4	Yes			57	3.3	-12.3	3.3	12.1	343
Newington	20.5	Yes			72	1.4	14.3	7.2	18.8	2,138
Branford	20.6	Yes			59	1.3	-14.5	5.7	16.2	1,238
Sprague	20.7	Yes			14	4.3	40.0	4.7	11.0	223
East Windsor	20.8	Yes			31	2.3	19.2	8.8	13.5	379
Windsor Locks	20.8	Yes			26	1.3	23.8	6.7	16.3	1,325
Glastonbury	20.9	No			63	1.6	5.0	7.7	13.4	560
Portland	21.0	Yes			18	1.3	5.9	5.1	15.6	378
Canaan*	21.1	Yes			5	3.5	-37.5	3.8	13.4	32
Enfield	21.3	Yes			70	1.3	2.9	7.7	12.8	1,271
Seymour	21.4	Yes			36	1.7	-16.3	4.2	14.8	970
Wallingford	21.4	Yes			74	1.2	-15.9	6.5	15.2	1,046
Shelton	21.5	No			63	1.2	6.8	6.5	13.4	1,234
Eastford	21.7	Yes			3	1.4	0.0	2.8	15.4	50
Cheshire	21.7	Yes			38	1.1	5.6	11.5	12.9	788
Winchester	21.7	No			27	1.6	-6.9	3.0	14.5	353
Rocky Hill	21.9	No			26	1.0	30.0	8.6	15.7	1,227

TABLE A.16
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR SOUTH WINDSOR, CONNECTICUT

	Similarity Index	Congregate Meals and MOW?	State-Wide Comparison Sites	State-Wide Congregate Meal/MOW Sites	Similarity Index Components: Elderly FSP Participants: Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot Town										
South Windsor	0.0	Yes			30	1.3	20.0	8.9	10.4	809
Other Towns										
Clinton	2.0	Yes	1	1	20	1.4	0.0	6.9	10.8	807
Ridgefield	2.7	No	2		17	0.7	6.3	4.9	10.8	639
Canton	2.7	No	3		6	0.7	20.0	3.4	11.3	329
Lebanon	2.8	Yes	4	2	9	1.5	28.6	3.3	9.4	120
Simsbury	2.8	No	5		23	0.8	21.1	5.1	12.7	642
Somers	2.8	No			9	0.8	12.5	11.2	11.9	325
East Haddam	3.0	Yes		3	12	1.3	9.1	3.0	12.0	137
Cheshire	3.0	Yes		4	38	1.1	5.6	11.5	12.9	788
Ellington	3.0	No			12	0.9	0.0	3.5	10.7	347
Brookfield	3.1	Yes		5	22	1.5	-12.0	5.2	10.0	737
Enfield	3.2	Yes			70	1.3	2.9	7.7	12.8	1,271
Colchester	3.2	No			28	2.2	16.7	4.0	9.7	272
Granby	3.2	No			9	0.9	0.0	3.0	10.1	236
New Milford	3.3	Yes			42	1.7	-4.5	6.2	9.6	417
Plymouth	3.4	Yes			19	1.2	5.6	2.3	12.8	556
Shelton	3.4	No			63	1.2	6.8	6.5	13.4	1,234
Beacon Falls	3.4	Yes			8	1.4	-11.1	2.6	10.7	528
Guilford	3.6	No			32	1.3	-5.9	3.8	12.5	425
Montville	3.6	Yes			37	1.9	-7.5	10.1	11.2	411
Mansfield	3.7	Yes			26	1.7	30.0	17.2	8.7	393
Newtown	3.8	Yes			16	0.7	-11.1	5.1	10.5	401
Ashford	3.8	Yes			3	0.8	0.0	4.7	9.3	101
Columbia	3.8	Yes			5	0.9	0.0	3.3	11.6	231
Glastonbury	3.8	No			63	1.6	5.0	7.7	13.4	560
East Windsor	4.0	Yes			31	2.3	19.2	8.8	13.5	379
Coventry	4.0	Yes			15	1.4	-11.8	3.1	9.2	298
Wolcott	4.1	Yes			21	1.0	10.5	4.1	14.4	699
North Branford	4.1	Yes			22	1.3	-18.5	3.8	11.8	557
Thomaston	4.2	Yes			13	1.3	0.0	2.1	13.6	610
Ledyard	4.2	Yes			12	1.0	-14.3	7.8	8.5	388
Durham	4.3	No			2	0.3	0.0	3.2	10.6	277
Wilton	4.3	Yes			5	0.2	25.0	5.2	12.8	613
Prospect	4.3	Yes			10	0.8	25.0	4.8	14.6	574
Preston	4.3	No			9	1.2	12.5	5.7	15.1	163
Cromwell	4.4	Yes			25	1.2	8.7	7.0	16.0	1,008
Windsor Locks	4.4	Yes			26	1.3	23.8	6.7	16.3	1,325
Naugatuck	4.5	Yes			80	2.3	5.3	7.8	11.5	1,842
Oxford	4.5	Yes			9	1.1	-18.2	3.4	9.2	278
Rocky Hill	4.5	No			26	1.0	30.0	8.6	15.7	1,227
Redding	4.5	Yes			3	0.3	0.0	4.9	11.5	258
Bethel	4.6	Yes			32	1.9	-23.8	7.6	9.4	1,063
Canterbury	4.6	Yes			11	2.4	37.5	2.7	9.9	117
East Granby	4.6	No			8	1.6	-20.0	4.3	11.6	253
Bolton	4.8	No			1	0.2	0.0	4.3	11.4	333
Bethlehem	4.8	Yes			5	1.2	-16.7	2.0	12.3	170
Portland	4.8	Yes			18	1.3	5.9	5.1	15.6	378
Weston	4.8	Yes			0	0.0	0.0	5.0	11.3	447
Pomfret	4.9	Yes			9	2.0	12.5	1.9	13.4	84
New Hartford	5.0	No			0	0.0	0.0	2.7	10.1	166
Southington	5.0	Yes			74	1.4	-11.9	3.9	13.4	1,067
Harwinton	5.1	Yes			4	0.6	33.3	1.2	13.0	174
Stafford	5.1	Yes			31	2.2	-6.1	4.3	12.2	203
Vernon	5.1	Yes			93	2.4	9.4	8.7	12.8	1,675
Madison	5.1	No			13	0.6	30.0	3.4	14.2	447
Kent	5.1	No			4	0.9	33.3	7.3	15.1	64
Farmington	5.1	No			56	1.7	7.7	6.6	15.8	751

TABLE A.17
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR STAFFORD, CONNECTICUT

					Similarity Index Components					
					Elderly FSP Participants					
	Similarity Index	Congregate Meals and MOW?	State-Wide Comparison Sites	State-Wide Congregate Meal/MOW Sites	Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot Town										
Stafford	0.0	Yes			31	2.2	-6.1	4.3	12.2	203
Other Towns										
Guilford	1.9	No	1		32	1.3	-5.9	3.8	12.5	425
Montville	2.0	Yes	2	1	37	1.9	-7.5	10.1	11.2	411
East Granby	2.4	No	3		8	1.6	-20.0	4.3	11.6	253
Pomfret	2.6	Yes	4	2	9	2.0	12.5	1.9	13.4	84
Winchester	2.7	No	5		27	1.6	-6.9	3.0	14.5	353
North Branford	2.7	Yes		3	22	1.3	-18.5	3.8	11.8	557
Plainfield	2.7	Yes		4	57	3.3	-12.3	3.3	12.1	343
East Haddam	2.8	Yes		5	12	1.3	9.1	3.0	12.0	137
Bethlehem	2.8	Yes			5	1.2	-16.7	2.0	12.3	170
New Milford	2.9	Yes			42	1.7	-4.5	6.2	9.6	417
Colchester	2.9	No			28	2.2	16.7	4.0	9.7	272
Beacon Falls	3.0	Yes			8	1.4	-11.1	2.6	10.7	528
Thompson	3.1	No			29	2.0	0.0	2.0	15.9	192
Naugatuck	3.1	Yes			80	2.3	5.3	7.8	11.5	1,842
East Windsor	3.2	Yes			31	2.3	19.2	8.8	13.5	379
Southington	3.2	Yes			74	1.4	-11.9	3.9	13.4	1,067
Glastonbury	3.2	No			63	1.6	5.0	7.7	13.4	560
Plymouth	3.2	Yes			19	1.2	5.6	2.3	12.8	556
Clinton	3.3	Yes			20	1.4	0.0	6.9	10.8	807
Columbia	3.3	Yes			5	0.9	0.0	3.3	11.6	231
Brookfield	3.3	Yes			22	1.5	-12.0	5.2	10.0	737
Thomaston	3.4	Yes			13	1.3	0.0	2.1	13.6	610
Seymour	3.4	Yes			36	1.7	-16.3	4.2	14.8	970
Coventry	3.7	Yes			15	1.4	-11.8	3.1	9.2	298
Ellington	3.7	No			12	0.9	0.0	3.5	10.7	347
Vernon	3.7	Yes			93	2.4	9.4	8.7	12.8	1,675
Marlborough	3.7	No			11	2.5	0.0	3.5	7.8	245
Enfield	3.8	Yes			70	1.3	2.9	7.7	12.8	1,271
Suffield	3.8	Yes			17	1.0	-5.6	4.8	14.9	264
Griswold	3.9	Yes			44	3.5	10.0	3.3	11.7	308
Plainville	3.9	Yes			52	2.1	4.0	7.4	15.0	1,724
Chaplin	4.0	Yes			1	0.4	0.0	2.4	12.1	115
Bethel	4.1	Yes			32	1.9	-23.8	7.6	9.4	1,063
Granby	4.1	No			9	0.9	0.0	3.0	10.1	236
Woodbury	4.2	Yes			8	0.7	-11.1	3.9	13.9	236
Eastford	4.2	Yes			3	1.4	0.0	2.8	15.4	50
Brooklyn	4.2	Yes			8	0.9	-20.0	7.7	13.0	241
Watertown	4.2	Yes			31	1.0	-13.9	3.9	14.4	743
Shelton	4.2	No			63	1.2	6.8	6.5	13.4	1,234
Cheshire	4.2	Yes			38	1.1	5.6	11.5	12.9	788
Newtown	4.3	Yes			16	0.7	-11.1	5.1	10.5	401
Redding	4.3	Yes			3	0.3	0.0	4.9	11.5	258
Groton	4.3	Yes			107	2.5	-6.1	16.0	10.4	1,328
Scotland	4.3	Yes			1	0.5	0.0	2.9	13.3	77
Woodstock	4.5	Yes			7	0.8	0.0	1.5	14.0	108
Bristol	4.5	Yes			195	2.3	-8.5	7.6	14.3	2,234
Ridgefield	4.5	No			17	0.7	6.3	4.9	10.8	639
Stonington	4.6	Yes			58	2.0	7.4	3.8	17.3	442
Portland	4.6	Yes			18	1.3	5.9	5.1	15.6	378
Farmington	4.6	No			56	1.7	7.7	6.6	15.8	751
Bolton	4.6	No			1	0.2	0.0	4.3	11.4	333
Canterbury	4.7	Yes			11	2.4	37.5	2.7	9.9	117
Wolcott	4.7	Yes			21	1.0	10.5	4.1	14.4	699
Simsbury	4.7	No			23	0.8	21.1	5.1	12.7	642
Oxford	4.7	Yes			9	1.1	-18.2	3.4	9.2	278

TABLE A.18
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR WINDSOR, CONNECTICUT

					Similarity Index Components					
					Elderly FSP Participants					
	Similarity Index	Congregate Meals and MOW?	State-Wide Comparison Sites	State-Wide Congregate Meal/MOW Sites	Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot Town										
Windsor	0.0	Yes			89	2.2	-13.6	27.2	14.7	930
Other Towns										
Seymour	4.3	Yes	1	1	36	1.7	-16.3	4.2	14.8	970
Plainville	4.7	Yes	2	2	52	2.1	4.0	7.4	15.0	1,724
Bristol	4.7	Yes	3	3	195	2.3	-8.5	7.6	14.3	2,234
Wallingford	5.0	Yes	4	4	74	1.2	-15.9	6.5	15.2	1,046
Middletown	5.1	Yes	5	5	175	3.2	-9.8	19.2	12.4	1,060
Groton	5.2	Yes			107	2.5	-6.1	16.0	10.4	1,328
Southington	5.3	Yes			74	1.4	-11.9	3.9	13.4	1,067
Winchester	5.3	No			27	1.6	-6.9	3.0	14.5	353
Branford	5.5	Yes			59	1.3	-14.5	5.7	16.2	1,238
Manchester	5.6	Yes			204	2.6	5.7	11.0	15.1	1,882
Vernon	5.6	Yes			93	2.4	9.4	8.7	12.8	1,675
Glastonbury	5.6	No			63	1.6	5.0	7.7	13.4	560
Stafford	5.7	Yes			31	2.2	-6.1	4.3	12.2	203
Derby	5.7	Yes			49	2.2	-12.5	10.3	18.6	2,390
Watertown	5.7	Yes			31	1.0	-13.9	3.9	14.4	743
Farmington	5.7	No			56	1.7	7.7	6.6	15.8	751
Montville	5.7	Yes			37	1.9	-7.5	10.1	11.2	411
Milford	5.8	Yes			133	1.7	2.3	6.6	15.3	2,208
East Windsor	5.8	Yes			31	2.3	19.2	8.8	13.5	379
Thompson	5.9	No			29	2.0	0.0	2.0	15.9	192
Naugatuck	6.2	Yes			80	2.3	5.3	7.8	11.5	1,842
Suffield	6.4	Yes			17	1.0	-5.6	4.8	14.9	264
Cheshire	6.4	Yes			38	1.1	5.6	11.5	12.9	788
Enfield	6.5	Yes			70	1.3	2.9	7.7	12.8	1,271
Torrington	6.5	Yes			123	1.9	3.4	5.2	18.2	872
Shelton	6.6	No			63	1.2	6.8	6.5	13.4	1,234
Stonington	6.6	Yes			58	2.0	7.4	3.8	17.3	442
Ansonia	6.8	Yes			103	3.6	-4.6	14.8	16.3	2,937
Cromwell	6.8	Yes			25	1.2	8.7	7.0	16.0	1,008
Deep River	6.8	Yes			7	1.1	-30.0	4.0	14.6	329
Thomaston	6.9	Yes			13	1.3	0.0	2.1	13.6	610
Greenwich	6.9	Yes			83	0.8	5.1	14.2	17.3	1,218
Portland	6.9	Yes			18	1.3	5.9	5.1	15.6	378
Pomfret	6.9	Yes			9	2.0	12.5	1.9	13.4	84
Eastford	6.9	Yes			3	1.4	0.0	2.8	15.4	50
Westbrook	7.0	Yes			19	1.9	-20.8	4.2	18.4	355
Plainfield	7.0	Yes			57	3.3	-12.3	3.3	12.1	343
Guilford	7.0	No			32	1.3	-5.9	3.8	12.5	425
Brooklyn	7.1	Yes			8	0.9	-20.0	7.7	13.0	241
North Branford	7.1	Yes			22	1.3	-18.5	3.8	11.8	557
Putnam	7.1	Yes			48	3.1	-5.9	4.0	17.4	438
Bethel	7.1	Yes			32	1.9	-23.8	7.6	9.4	1,063
Wolcott	7.2	Yes			21	1.0	10.5	4.1	14.4	699
East Granby	7.2	No			8	1.6	-20.0	4.3	11.6	253
Hamden	7.2	Yes			202	1.9	0.0	15.2	19.9	1,631
Woodbury	7.2	Yes			8	0.7	-11.1	3.9	13.9	236
Preston	7.3	No			9	1.2	12.5	5.7	15.1	163
Brookfield	7.4	Yes			22	1.5	-12.0	5.2	10.0	737
Bethlehem	7.5	Yes			5	1.2	-16.7	2.0	12.3	170
Danbury	7.5	Yes			299	3.8	-1.6	23.7	12.0	1,551
East Haven	7.5	Yes			138	3.1	2.2	4.6	16.4	2,178
Westport	7.6	Yes			16	0.4	-5.9	6.8	15.9	1,206
Clinton	7.6	Yes			20	1.4	0.0	6.9	10.8	807
Woodbridge	7.6	Yes			10	0.7	-9.1	8.1	17.2	428
New Milford	7.7	Yes			42	1.7	-4.5	6.2	9.6	417

TABLE A.19
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR WINDSOR LOCKS, CONNECTICUT

					Similarity Index Components					
					Elderly FSP Participants					
	Similarity Index	Congregate Meals and MOW?	State-Wide Comparison Sites	State-Wide Congregate Meal/MOW Sites	Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation	Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
Pilot Town										
Windsor Locks	0.0	Yes			26	1.3	23.8	6.7	16.3	1,325
Other Towns										
Cromwell	1.4	Yes	1	1	25	1.2	8.7	7.0	16.0	1,008
Rocky Hill	1.6	No	2		26	1.0	30.0	8.6	15.7	1,227
Trumbull	1.8	Yes	3	2	61	1.1	13.0	6.7	16.9	1,454
Portland	2.3	Yes	4	3	18	1.3	5.9	5.1	15.6	378
Farmington	2.4	No	5		56	1.7	7.7	6.6	15.8	751
Berlin	2.5	Yes		4	24	0.8	33.3	4.2	16.8	655
Preston	2.6	No			9	1.2	12.5	5.7	15.1	163
North Haven	2.7	Yes		5	49	1.2	28.9	7.0	19.2	1,059
Branford	2.7	Yes			59	1.3	-14.5	5.7	16.2	1,238
Prospect	2.8	Yes			10	0.8	25.0	4.8	14.6	574
Newington	3.0	Yes			72	1.4	14.3	7.2	18.8	2,138
Kent	3.1	No			4	0.9	33.3	7.3	15.1	64
Wolcott	3.2	Yes			21	1.0	10.5	4.1	14.4	699
Shelton	3.2	No			63	1.2	6.8	6.5	13.4	1,234
Eastford	3.4	Yes			3	1.4	0.0	2.8	15.4	50
Darien	3.4	Yes			9	0.3	28.6	6.1	14.3	1,413
Old Lyme	3.6	Yes			8	0.7	14.3	3.1	17.5	287
Plainville	3.7	Yes			52	2.1	4.0	7.4	15.0	1,724
Westport	3.7	Yes			16	0.4	-5.9	6.8	15.9	1,206
Wallingford	3.8	Yes			74	1.2	-15.9	6.5	15.2	1,046
Chester	3.8	Yes			5	0.8	0.0	3.6	15.8	239
Union	3.8	No			1	0.9	0.0	2.2	16.2	24
Simsbury	3.8	No			23	0.8	21.1	5.1	12.7	642
Stonington	3.8	Yes			58	2.0	7.4	3.8	17.3	442
Enfield	3.9	Yes			70	1.3	2.9	7.7	12.8	1,271
Milford	3.9	Yes			133	1.7	2.3	6.6	15.3	2,208
Madison	4.0	No			13	0.6	30.0	3.4	14.2	447
Greenwich	4.0	Yes			83	0.8	5.1	14.2	17.3	1,218
Suffield	4.1	Yes			17	1.0	-5.6	4.8	14.9	264
Thomaston	4.1	Yes			13	1.3	0.0	2.1	13.6	610
Thompson	4.1	No			29	2.0	0.0	2.0	15.9	192
Glastonbury	4.2	No			63	1.6	5.0	7.7	13.4	560
Plymouth	4.4	Yes			19	1.2	5.6	2.3	12.8	556
Woodbridge	4.4	Yes			10	0.7	-9.1	8.1	17.2	428
Cheshire	4.4	Yes			38	1.1	5.6	11.5	12.9	788
South Windsor	4.4	Yes			30	1.3	20.0	8.9	10.4	809
Winchester	4.4	No			27	1.6	-6.9	3.0	14.5	353
East Windsor	4.5	Yes			31	2.3	19.2	8.8	13.5	379
Seymour	4.5	Yes			36	1.7	-16.3	4.2	14.8	970
Torrington	4.6	Yes			123	1.9	3.4	5.2	18.2	872
Watertown	4.7	Yes			31	1.0	-13.9	3.9	14.4	743
Bridgewater	4.7	Yes			1	0.4	0.0	3.3	15.9	108
East Haddam	4.7	Yes			12	1.3	9.1	3.0	12.0	137
Wilton	4.8	Yes			5	0.2	25.0	5.2	12.8	613
Southington	4.9	Yes			74	1.4	-11.9	3.9	13.4	1,067
Waterford	4.9	Yes			36	1.0	0.0	7.6	20.1	555
Pomfret	5.0	Yes			9	2.0	12.5	1.9	13.4	84
Guilford	5.1	No			32	1.3	-5.9	3.8	12.5	425
Hampton	5.1	Yes			1	0.4	0.0	3.5	15.0	64
Clinton	5.2	Yes			20	1.4	0.0	6.9	10.8	807
Orange	5.2	Yes			15	0.6	-6.3	6.2	19.2	719
Avon	5.3	No			6	0.3	-14.3	4.6	15.7	598
Woodstock	5.3	Yes			7	0.8	0.0	1.5	14.0	108

One problem that will arise in understanding the impact of the Connecticut demonstration is that a separate FSP outreach demonstration is currently underway in Hartford. This demonstration directly targets elderly nonparticipants (as well as former TANF recipients, low income families with children, able-bodied adults, and non-English speaking minorities) and provides FSP outreach and education programs to increase awareness of benefits and FSP application procedures. As a result, it will be difficult to distinguish the impact of this demonstration from the impacts of the Elderly Nutrition Demonstration in Hartford and the surrounding towns. To address this issue, the evaluators should use the process analysis and client satisfaction survey to explore the extent to which changes in FSP participation in the Hartford area are related to the Elderly Nutrition demonstration.